

THE
LIFE AND TIMES

OF

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

BY

WILLIAM FAGAN, ESQ., M.P.

VOL. II.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

CORK :

JOHN O'BRIEN.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO., LONDON.

T. LEMESURIER, AND RICHARDSON & SON, DUBLIN.

OLIVER & BOYD, EDINBURGH.

1848.

DD
Q.3.
F2
183-51
vol 2

205473

O'NEILL LIBRARY
BOSTON COLLEGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

1830—1833.

Commencement of the agitation for the Repeal of the Union—The O'Connell Memoir of Ireland—The question of Repeal considered—O'Connell's Letter to the People of Ireland on this subject—Letter to the electors of Clare on the Grand Jury Law—Formation of the Society of the Friends of Ireland—its suppression by Proclamation—encounter with Mr. Doherty and Lord F. L. Gower—the Clare Election of 1830—Collision with O'Gorman Mahon—O'Connell's Election for Waterford County—Letters on Repeal, Dinner in Cork, new agitation—Opinion of a London Paper—attempt to form Anti-Union Association—affair with Sir Henry Hardinge—the Public Breakfast—Leinster Declaration—proceedings of the Marquis of Anglesey—the Annuity—proceedings in Drogheda—the Tithe question—Government Proclamations—Scene at Hayes's Tavern—Address to the People of Ireland on the Banks—Scenes at the Theatre and Police Office, Dublin—Prosecution of O'Connell under the Algerine Act—Juvenile Meeting in Dublin—Reform in England—the Elections—Massacre at Newtownbarry—retort on Sir Charles Wetherall—O'Connell's refusal of Office—passing of the National Education Act—quarrel with the Dublin Press in 1831—Lord Stanley's Tithe measure—agitation against Tithes

—O'Connell's Controversy with Dr. Doyle—triumphal entry into Cork—Collision with the Dublin Trades' Union—passing of the Tithes Bill—Letter from O'Connell—continuation of Tithe Agitation—Coercion Act—Speech of O'Connell in opposition to it—plan of pacification—proceedings of Lord Lyndhurst on the disfranchising clauses of the Reform Bill—the Duke of Wellington commissioned to form a Government—opinion of O'Connell on the Crisis—the Land and Franchise questions—Letters to the People of England—Speech of Lord Stanley on the £5 qualification—O'Connell in Belfast—Letter from Sir A. B. King—Sketch of O'Connell from the <i>New Monthly Magazine</i> —O'Connell at Darrynane—Letters—renewal of the Tithe agitation—Anecdote of O'Connell—Meeting of the Political Union—Sheil's Speech—the General Election of 1832—visit of Lord Anglesey to Cork—establishment of the Association of Irish Volunteers in 1833—Scene between O'Connell and O'Gorman Mahon—agitation against Lord Stanley's Tithe Act—Speech against the Coercion Bill—O'Connell's tenacity of memory— anecdote—the new Tithe Bill—Speech on Negro Slavery—postponement of the Repeal question—Letter from Feargus O'Connor—reply of O'Connell—quarrel of O'Connell with the Reporters of the Times—refusal of Office by O'Connell—Dinner in Cork—Prosecution of the <i>Pilot</i> —Death of Count O'Connell—Conclusion.....	275
---	-----

CHAPTER SECOND.

1834—1835.

Agitation of 1834—"Who is the Traitor?"—Scene in the Commons—question of Repeal discussed in Parliament—Letters to the *Pilot*—the Tithe Bill—Resignation of the Ministry—the Elections of 1835—the Tamworth Manifesto—proceedings of the Orangemen of Dublin—Anecdote of O'Connell—the "Darby dilly"—Anecdote of Lord Haddington—escapes of O'Connell near Hilltown

and Omagh—the Irish Church Question—Resignation of Peel—the new Ministry—the Alvanley affair—the D’Israeli affair—the Religious crusade of 1835—Anecdote of O’Connell—the Orange system—O’Connell’s Letter to the Duke of Wellington—Tour in Scotland—return to Ireland—Lord Mulgrave as Viceroy—the Raphael affair—Letter of Sir Francis Burdett—Reply of O’Connell—Conclusion.	489
--	-----

CHAPTER THIRD.

1836—1837.

Agitation for Justice to Ireland—foundation of the National Bank—Address of Merchants of Cork—O’Connell’s reception in England—Poor Laws—Irish Municipal Bill—Speech of Sheil—Lord Lyndhurst’s alien declaration—Tour in England—the new Tithe Bill—Scene in the House of Commons—Subscription in England—O’Connell unseated for Dublin—the M’Ghee affair—Den’s Theology—O’Connell’s return to Dublin—Agitation—Factory question—calumny against O’Connell on the question of short time—Correspondence—explanation of O’Connell—Death of Mrs. O’Connell—renewal of the agitation—dispute with Sharman Crawford—run on the <i>National Banks</i> —Letter from O’Connell—the <i>Dublin Review</i> —dispute with Smith O’Brien—Municipal Reform—Speeches of Sheil and Wolfe—death of William IV.—the Elections—Anecdotes—O’Connell as a Freemason—the new Parliament—proceedings of the Orangemen—the Battle of the Diamond—Westminster Reform Meeting—Conclusion.	672
--	-----

LIFE AND TIMES
OF
DANIEL O'CONNELL.

CHAPTER I.

1830---1833.

We now approach a subject which was destined before long, to be a far more absorbing topic, in Irish politics, than Catholic Emancipation — we mean the REPEAL OF THE LEGISLATIVE UNION. The Irish people never lost sight of this most important question. We have seen how warmly, in 1810, it was taken up by the Dublin Corporation, and how anxiously O'CONNELL supported it then, and at a previous period. Since then, up to 1830, it was at various intervals the subject of partial discussion. There was no organised agitation in its favor; for the anxiety to obtain religious freedom engrossed the public mind. But the love of Legislative Independence was still strong in the popular heart; and it was evident that whenever the time arrived, the people would be ready for its agitation. We have purposely deferred, until this period, all discussion of this all-absorbing subject; but before entering on the history of O'CONNELL'S life and times, subsequent to Emancipation, it may be

well to make some passing remarks on the great question which for so many years occupied his exclusive attention.

When it is considered what Ireland now is, and what she might have been, if left to her own resources, few can avoid feeling the most heartfelt sorrow at the fate which subjected her to the mercy of British legislation. What is she now?—A depressed and impoverished province; exhibiting all the plague spots of an old country, without any of its accumulated resources—with all the weakness of a young nation, but without its elasticity or its growth. Without commerce—without manufactures—with empty harbours—with rivers flowing idly to the sea—with a fruitful soil sending forth its rich abundance for the benefit of another land—with two millions and a half of people plunged in destitution—here she is, a producer of labour for England and her Colonies—a feeder of cattle for England's consumption, a grower of corn for England's use, and a retailer of manufactures for England's advantage. Such is Ireland!—Was it nature produced this state of things? No; nature has been truly bountiful to Ireland. Consider her in every point of view, and you will find that “Nature and Nature's God” made her capable of being a great and prosperous people; and that man, as it were, marred all these magnificent designs. Consider her insular condition. That, of itself, gives her immense advantages, in a commercial point of view. In that respect, her physical and geographical condition is superior to that of England—Ireland is of an oval shape, and the interior of the country is mountainous. The consequences of these two circumstances are, that no portion of her soil is distant more than fifty miles from the sea;—that there are noble rivers and tributary streams running in every direction to the ocean; that there are harbours all

round her coast, at distances one from the other of not more than thirty miles ; that there is more mill power in one of her rivers than in all the steam-engines of England—and, finally, that she is placed in advance of the nations of Europe, as the natural emporium for the commerce of the old and new world.

Thus is Ireland endowed ; thus was she designed by Nature to become a rich, prosperous, and powerful nation. There can be no doubt that, if left to work out her own fortunes, she would, as civilization spread, have taken a foremost position amongst the nations of the globe. Looking back upon the past history of this unhappy country, and reflecting upon what she might have been, had Nature, and the intellectual energies of the people been allowed full development ; and contrasting her past condition with what she is now—crushed, famine-stricken and insolvent, it is impossible not to regret that England ever attained pre-eminence in Ireland. It is difficult to suppress emotions of an impassioned character, when the mind dwells on the evils of her sway. In the first place, Ireland was at one period far advanced in civilization beyond England ; and though that civilization was uprooted by the roots, during the Danish invasions ; yet, after Ireland had got rid of those barbarians, she would again have assumed her former position ; and while England was engaged in her Continental squabbles, Ireland, protected by her geographical position, would have pushed forward, and taking advantage of the bounties of Providence, have outstripped England in prosperity, and equalled her in strength.—But, unhappily, it was otherwise decreed. It is useless to dwell at length upon the dreadful history of Ireland, under British domination. That has been portrayed by a master's hand ; never were the cruelties and oppressions inflicted upon a country, grouped together

in such striking array, as in that terrible truth-teller—O'CONNELL'S Memoir of Ireland—That work has already produced a sensation throughout Europe ; and when by means of cheap publication, it comes into the hands of the Irish people, what an awful summary of English injustice, will it place before them ?

The publication of that book may well be called an event ; for it certainly will do much to mould the feelings of future generations of Irishmen. That work, as far as it has gone, has traced the black and blood-stained outline of England's rule in Ireland. But it remains for another historian to pourtray the hollow treachery of the second CHARLES—the sufferings and fidelity of the Irish Catholics, during the career of the ungrateful JAMES—the breach of faith during the reign of the third WILLIAM—the penal laws of ANNE, and so on, until the relaxation of that code, in 1778, interrupts, for the first time, the long and black catalogue of English oppressions. It will be found, from the very commencement to the very end, that man marred and counteracted all the good that God and Nature designed for Ireland. In 1778, England was forced, from her necessities, to alter her conduct.—For the first time, she had to depend altogether on the Irish people for the security of Ireland. It was then the first step towards conciliation was made, by giving Catholics the power of taking land on long leases ; then followed Free Trade in 1780 ; and Legislative Independence in 1782. These three great measures, succeeding each other in so short a time, imparted an expansive vigor to national prosperity. The Act of 1778, gave encouragement to the investment of capital in agriculture, and hence the resources of the soil were more extensively developed. Without this, the Act of 1780, would have been of no value ; with it the Free Trade boon gave a

vast impulse to commerce—indeed, almost too great an impulse; because overtrading was the consequence; and commercial distress, as illustrated by the crashing of the Banks in 1792, '93—was the result. Then came the Act of 1782, which gave confidence to the nation, that the boons thus obtained could not be recalled by English enactments. At the same time, whilst every one appreciates the great victory won in 1782, and knows, full well, if the results of that victory were allowed to develop themselves, they would have proved advantageous to the whole Irish nation—Catholics as well as Protestants—yet, looking at the history of Ireland, and of the Irish Parliament, subsequent to 1782, it must be confessed that the character of the Irish Parliament was not national:—that the Legislature did not embrace the whole people of Ireland. It was emphatically a sectarian, or Protestant parliament. All its acts—all its struggles for independence, were for a party, and not for the nation. The masses had nothing to say to it; the Catholics had no franchises, and even the patriotism of GRATTAN and of CHARLEMONT, like that of SWIFT, and MOLYNEUX, and LUCAS, was but for a small section of the people. It cannot be forgotten that by this Parliament the Catholic petition was ignominiously rejected. It cannot be forgotten that Lord CHARLEMONT, the leader of the Volunteers, was opposed to the emancipation of the Irish people:—for the Catholics were then, as they are now, the people of Ireland. It must not be suppressed that, exasperated by this hostility, some Catholic communities petitioned for the Union. Therefore it is, that the Irish Parliament cannot be regarded as a national Parliament, or such a one as would suit the people at the present day. The fact is, however, obvious that but for the Union, it would shortly have become a more national assembly, and have embraced the universal people.

It would not be correct to give to the act of Legislative Independence, the whole credit of the prosperity which ensued, subsequently to the passing of that measure. That prosperity was in a great degree owing to the long lease and free trade Acts; and in reference to the commercial prosperity of the country, the benefit of the constitution of 1782, was to give security to the people, that these acts could not be nullified by England. Neither can the prosperity of the Irish people at that period be deemed universal. It is known that in 1784, the manufacturers of Ireland were in great distress; and when Mr. GARDINE, in a very celebrated speech, brought the subject of protecting duties before the House of Commons, his resolutions received no countenance. His eloquent description of the poverty of the people is on record, and his assertion is remembered, that it was utterly useless for Irish manufacturers to attempt competition with the English Capitalists, who were enabled, as they are now, to give long credits; and by the length of their purses, overwhelm any one who attempted to set up a manufactory in Ireland. At the same time, it is undeniable that a vast impulse was given to our manufactures, by the enactments of the Irish Parliament, subsequent to 1782. Every volume of the statutes, from that time to the Union, contains, year after year, laws for the encouragement of home manufactures. Thousands upon thousands of pounds, were annually given as bounties on the sale of industrial products: encouragement was afforded the manufacture of Linen: the export trade was fostered with great diligence—large sums were expended on canals, roads, &c.,—and large protecting duties were imposed even on English manufactures. The consequence of encouragement thus afforded was, that, notwithstanding great English competition, and though these English capitalists endeavoured to put down

every one who established manufactures in Ireland, by underselling them in the Irish market, Irish manufactures continued from 1785 to improve and flourish in Ireland; and it is impossible to deny that such results were produced through the fostering protection of a Domestic Parliament. Lord CASTLEREAGH went so far as to state, that the reason he proposed, in the Act of Union, to take off all protecting duties, after twenty years, was, that if Ireland continued to increase in manufacturing prosperity, in the next twenty years, as she did since 1782, she would need no protection at all; and that even in the English markets she would compete with English skill and capital. Ireland certainly laboured under one great disadvantage. It was this:—the law of patents gave the inventor of any new machinery, a fourteen years' lease of the invention; and, consequently, when inventions were discovered, as was the case in England, then Ireland was deprived of its benefit for fourteen years. Thus was it with ARKWRIGHT's celebrated invention of the spinning frame, which enabled some one hundred and fifty spindles to be regulated by one person, and which was the great means of so cheapening production, as to enable the English manufacturer to undersell the India muslins, in the India markets, after bringing the raw material from India. Thus was it that the patent for this celebrated invention, did not run out until 1785; and it was not 'till that year that the cotton manufacture could, with any chance of success, be introduced into Ireland. Again, the power loom, the great invention of CARTWRIGHT, was not invented until about the same period. Every one knows the revolution this caused in manufactures; and though the Union hastened, consummated and rendered irremediable, the ruin of manufactures in Ireland, there can be no

question, that this invention, by cheapening production in England four-fold, was one great cause of their decline.— However, be that as it may, no person who reads the proceedings in the Irish Parliament, from 1782 to 1800, but must admit, whatever other faults he may find with it, that under its protection, the trade and manufactures of Ireland flourished and expanded.

But in 1789, the Regency question came on for discussion,—The Irish Parliament took a different view of the subject from that adopted by the English Parliament, and the English Minister. It was an awkward disagreement, and opened the eyes of PITT to the probability, at a future time, of Ireland choosing one Regent, and England another. Besides, he saw how his commercial articles were rejected, or obliged to be withdrawn, in 1785. He therefore considered, there should be, *coute qui coute*, a legislative union effected between the two countries. How did he proceed?— First, he raised up the hopes of the Irish people, by sending over to Ireland, as Lord Lieutenant, Lord FITZWILLIAM, for the express purpose of forwarding Catholic Emancipation; and when their hopes were so exalted, and the measure almost, as was supposed, within their grasp, the Earl FITZWILLIAM was forced to abandon his project, and retire from the Government. This disappointment laid the foundation for the rebellion. The Government, in 1797, was aware of what was in contemplation, and knew all the plans of the United Irishmen; and yet they allowed discontent, contrary to the advice of Lord CLONMEL, to ripen, until at last it burst out into frightful anarchy over the whole country. The Union was the result of that rebellion; men were so broken down and dispirited, that they made but slight resistance to that suicidal measure. While the most open and disguised bribery was employed—intimidation—the In-

surrection Act—military law—all the powers of Government were used to carry their object. No scruple stood in Lord CASTLEREAGH's way, in accomplishing this favourite object of Mr. PITT. The consequence was, that against the will of the nation—without any constitutional power to do so, the Irish Parliament voted its own extinction, and destroyed the independence of Ireland.—The mere mode, therefore, in which the present Act of Union was carried, is sufficient ground to object to its continuance. But the basis on which it was framed, and its consequences, offer more abundant arguments against that nefarious measure.

One of the principal provisions in the Act of Union is, that which provides for the respective contributions of both countries. Nothing could be more unjust than the data from which it was calculated, that Ireland should pay two-seventeenths of the general expenditure. The principle of the calculation was, the relative capabilities of both countries; and the *criteria* to judge of these were taken to be the aggregate of imports and exports of each country, and the consumption of certain articles yielding excise duties. Now imports and exports are not correct *criteria* to judge of the prosperity of a country. It does not follow, because a country exports and imports largely, that therefore it is prosperous; and of all countries, Ireland, with her absentee rentals, is a proof to the contrary. But if the balance of trade be in favor of a country—that is, if she gets paid for all she exports, and that she exports more produce than she imports for consumption—then capital must be increased; and therefore the balance of trade is a fair criterion to judge of national prosperity. M'CULLAGH and other modern economists, sneer at the notion of there being such a thing as balance of trade at all—that is, that

that balance is paid in bullion. Such must, however, not immediately, but ultimately, be the case. Otherwise how can the enormously accumulated resources of England be accounted for? If her exports, which are but the surplus of her home consumption, only attract produce from foreign countries, also to be consumed, there would be no surplus of revenue, and therefore no accumulation.

The balance of exports over imports is, therefore, a better criterion by which to judge of the prosperity of a country, than the amount of its imports and exports. Neither is the amount of consumable articles consumed, a true criterion of the capability of a country to contribute to the general expenditure. This consumption depends a good deal upon habit; and Ireland is a glorious instance how much a nation's prosperity may depend upon the non-consumption of exciseable articles. It may, however, be admitted, in conformity with the opinion of the Lords who signed the protest in 1800, that the permanent taxation of both countries, would be a fair item to take, in judging of the future liability of each to contribute. Taking then the balance of trade in favour of each country, and the permanent taxes of both as a better basis of calculation, it will be found that the balance of trade in favour of Ireland, was to the balance of trade in favour of England, as one to twenty-nine. The permanent taxes of Ireland were to those of England as one to thirteen. If both these ratios are compounded, it will be ascertained that one to twenty-one, was the fair proportion in which Ireland ought to have contributed to the general expenditure; instead of two to seventeen. What subsequently occurred, proves this not to be far from the correct proportion. At the Union, the debt of Ireland was about £25,000,000, and the debt of England about £480,000,000

—that is, in the ratio, of one to seventeen. Now, it is clear that if Ireland was capable of bearing two-seventeenths of the burdens of the empire, her debt would always have kept at that ratio with the English debt—and therefore that the part of the seventh article of the Union, which enacted, that when the Irish debt came within two-seventeenths of the English, both debts should be consolidated, and the respective revenues of both countries united, would never have been, as it unfortunately was, in 1817, carried into operation. But in point of fact, the respective debts, instead of remaining at the proportion to each other, of one to seventeen, actually came within the stipulated ratio. Ireland owed, at the Union, in 1801, £30,068,822 stock, and in 1816, she owed £131,331,097 stock—therefore she borrowed from 1801 to 1817, over £100,000,000 stock.—England owed, at the Union, £486,000,000 stock—she owed in 1817, £686,000,000—therefore she borrowed £200,000,000—that is, she borrowed but twice as much as Ireland. If Ireland's capability to contribute was as two to seventeen—she would have had occasion but to borrow in that proportion;—but in order to keep up her stipulated proportion of contributions, she had to borrow four times more than she ought, if that stipulated proportion were fairly assessed, according to her means; that is, she ought, in order to furnish her quota of two-seventeenths, to have borrowed but £25,000,000, instead of £100,000,000. Now, supposing that the revenue of Ireland, from 1801 to 1817, was £4,000,000 a year, or £68,000,000 for the whole time—then adding twenty-five millions to this, would give £93,000,000, the amount which she ought have paid according to her capability. But she paid £168,000,000, at the stipulated and unjust proportion of two-seventeenths. According to the rule of proportion, therefore, as

£168,000,000 is to two-seventeenths—so is £93,000,000 to one-fifteenth, the proportion which she ought to have contributed according to her means. Now, supposing she contributed since 1817, four millions a year to the expenditure, that would come to 100 millions; which added to the 168,000,000 paid up to 1817, would make £268,000,000. Supposing that sum to be contributed according to the stipulated proportion, and that Ireland ought to have contributed but one-fifteenth according to her means, then the sum she ought to have paid, would be one hundred and fifty-two millions; and, therefore, if the financial part of the Union were based on sound and just principles, and if the seventh article of the Union were fairly complied with, namely, that she was not to contribute but according to her means—for that was the basis of the whole agreement—then, it is plain, that Ireland has paid to England £116,000,000 more than she ought. This is alone sufficient to account for the evils which the present Union has inflicted on this country. But this is not all. Had the act of Union not passed, we never would have been involved in the expensive and ruinous war with NAPOLEON. The Irish Nation was never much inclined to enter into that war. It was emphatically a war of principles. It was aristocracy against democracy; and the tendency of the Irish character is decidedly democratic. We have Mr. PITT's admission, when discussing the Union, that if the Irish Parliament was as sturdy and determined at the commencement of the war with France, as it was at the time of the Commercial Propositions and the Regency question;—we have his admission, that if the Irish Parliament then opposed the War, as it did these measures, it would have cramped the proceedings; in other words, the war would never have been

undertaken. Though the Irish Parliament, at the outset of the revolution, when so much occurred to shock human nature, sanctioned that war, it may be assumed that after the Peace of Amiens, in 1801, Ireland would never have agreed to support the war, and the consequence would have been—PEACE. This would have saved millions to both countries; but it would have done something more for Ireland; it would have saved her manufactures from utter annihilation.

Lord CASTLEREAGH prophecied that, in twenty years, from 1801, if the manufactures of this country went on improving and increasing, with the same rapidity as since 1782, they would successfully compete with those of England. So they would, but for the war and the extinction of our Legislature. True it is, that the powerloom patent, which gave England such great facility of production, and of which Ireland could not have had the immediate advantages, would have sent the sister Kingdom far a head of us; but not to the utter annihilation of our manufactures. The war, by giving an enormous impulse to the productions of the power loom—the decrees of MILAN and BERLIN, by swelling twenty fold the profits of the manufacturers—overcame competition in Ireland, and placed England in such a position that, by the force of capital—of cheap production—she was enabled to undersell in their own markets the nations of the world. The extinction of our Legislature led to the withdrawal of local patronage and expenditure, of bounties, of direct and active protection and encouragement. The Union, by upholding the war, and by depriving our manufacturers of any support from Parliament, completely destroyed their vitality. It directed Irish capital into the cultivation of land; the consequence of which was, destruction and bankruptcy, when Peace was proclaimed

and prices fell. And the same state of things is now beginning to develop itself; when, in consequence of the operation of the Tariff, the capital embarked in land is destined to a still further diminution. Again, the Union, by assisting the natural tendency of great wealth to absorb and overwhelm smaller resources, and by facilitating the system of centralization, which becomes the policy of modern governments—by allowing the revenue departments to be taken from us—by sanctioning the removal of our Naval Depots—by concentrating round the seat of Government all the wealth, the property, the rank of the country—completely strips Ireland of her prosperity, and reduces her to the poverty and misery into which she has fallen. The Union, moreover, compelled Ireland to uphold the East India, the West India, and the Canada monopolies, at an expense to us of more than a million a year, merely to support markets for English manufactures.

Such was the effect of the Union, as far as it influenced our national prosperity. Now, how did it operate in a political point of view? It is perfectly obvious that but for the Union, Catholic Emancipation would have been obtained a quarter of a century before it was conceded; and, consequently, so would Reform in Parliament. We would not have obtained merely the stunted measure, which is now rather a misfortune than a blessing, to the persecuted holders of the Franchise. We would have had a measure of reform, which, while it protected popular rights, would not have required great individual sacrifices. We would have had Municipal Reform on a cheaper and more extended basis; and we would not still have, lording it over us, in the pride of its ascendancy—the Church Establishment. These are but a few of the political evils entailed upon this country by the Union, and

which are not likely to be remedied, while that one-sided compact continues to exist on its present basis.

The question to be considered now is, how are these evils to be remedied, and how is the remedy to be obtained? It is evident that English misrule produced the miseries of this country. It is equally evident that during the period Ireland had exclusively possessed the management of her own affairs; that is, from 1782 to 1800—she prospered more than any nation ever did in so short a time. It can be seen, by reference to the history of that era, that the English Government never interfered to check the prosperity of the country, so long as the Irish Parliament attended solely or principally to the advancement of her local interests. But the moment that Parliament came into collision with the English Legislature, then the whole weight of the Executive was engaged in behalf of England's exclusive interests, and the establishment of her legislative supremacy. It is also manifest, from every man's experience, that the English Parliament; is not well informed on the local affairs of this country; nor has it, in the multiplicity of its duties, time to attend to them. Nothing, then, will assist Nature in elevating the condition of Ireland, so much as an independent domestic Parliament. This arrangement cannot be effected without a Repeal of the existing Act of Union. How is that to be accomplished, in the teeth of the prejudices of the English Nation, and of part of the Irish Protestants and Proprietary? Simply by removing the prejudices, and proving that it is for the benefit of England that Ireland should manage her own local affairs, and, that the Irish Protestant community will be the chief gainers by such a consummation. How is that proof to be given? By demonstrating in a course of moderate and conciliatory conduct, that separation is

not our object ; that we believe such separation would be the destruction of Ireland—that in the hour of need we would require the aid of the wealthier country ; as, in the hour of danger she may depend upon the aid, bravery, and devotion, of the Irish people. Unless this be done, the Repeal of the Act of Union cannot be accomplished ; without co-operation amongst all classes in Ireland, and without the assistance of the constituencies in England, the English Parliament will not consent to such a measure. The Union cannot be repealed—the necessary co-operation cannot be accomplished, so long as the Irish Protestants—the Irish Proprietary—the English Government—the English Aristocracy, and the English people, look upon Repeal as equivalent to a dismemberment of the empire.

The conviction of not only the Government, the Lords, Commons, and People of England, but also of a considerable portion of the Irish nation—is, that Repeal would be equivalent to separation, and a dismemberment of the empire. And so strong was this conviction impressed on the minds of some of the leading Statesmen of England, friendly to this country, that they declared their determination to encounter civil war sooner than permit it. All admit, that before corrective impressions can be made on the English Parliament and Government—the majority of the Irish nation should be in favor of Repeal. The meaning of this is, that all ranks and classes of this nation, as was the case in 1782, should join in the demand. Property, intelligence, and numbers should go hand in hand. It appears an instinct of human nature, strengthened by the character of our social system, to allow a certain moral influence to property.—We see this exemplified in every-day life—great and unmeaning deference is paid to wealth. Men

are accustomed to hail with acclamation, the accession of men of property to the popular ranks. Intelligence and education have also their just influence, and every one knows the great moral power of numbers. Now let us see how those three elements of the national strength are ranked in the Repeal agitation. The permanent property of the country, we must admit—and we are not the persons who ought to blush at the circumstance, is in possession of the Protestant part of the nation. The numerical strength belongs to the Catholic portion. Unhappily, these are, or were antagonist forces—and have been, and still are in some measure, exerted in opposite directions. The third element, intelligence and knowledge, may be said to be equally divided amongst the other two. Now, it is quite plain that English connexion alone preserves Protestant ascendancy in this country. It is plain that if Ireland had no connexion with England, the national religion would obtain, as it deserves, an ascendancy at least tantamount to that of the Protestant. We don't mean the ascendancy of wealth; but the ascendancy of influence and station. It is equally plain that fears for the church establishment and church revenues, will influence the Protestant party, and deter a section of them from joining the agitation. They joined, it is true, in demanding legislative independence in 1782; but it must be remembered they did so to increase their own political monopoly. The Catholics were then nothing—they were scarcely thought of. It is very different now, when the Catholics are physically, intellectually, and politically more than equal with the Protestants. Property, too, is very sensitive—very apprehensive of great changes. We are, therefore, convinced the possessors of the fixed property in Ireland will not, in large numbers, join the

agitation for Repeal so long as they think it equivalent to separation. Then, as regards the other element—intelligence and education—we think the professions which depend upon Government patronage, and the countenance of the wealthy will hold off; and, in addition, those who believe in the impracticability of Repeal, and these are very numerous, will remain at least quiescent. It is true that the people will always join, and that is an important element in a crisis; but when approaching a hostile parliament and government, not backed by the other part of the community, they have not had great moral influence. Witness the way in which the petition of the English Chartists was treated, though signed by two millions of Englishmen—though its prayer was concurred in by the majority of the three nations, it was treated with the utmost contempt. We hold, then, that the weight of property, of numbers, and intelligence must be with the agitation, before it can be said to have with it the effective majority of the Irish nation. It certainly has now more of the Proprietary with it than heretofore, and there is a clear prospect of the numbers increasing. But there remain the English people, the English aristocracy, the English Government to be brought over. Unquestionably, if an entire people demanded a certain change in their institutions, they would have plainly, as Lord ALTHORP admitted, a perfect right to get it; and they would get it, if there did not exist another and a powerful nation acting on the common Government in a very opposite direction. If one nation demanded a certain right, and another resisted it—then we say, moral influence loses its weight, and it becomes a physical force struggle in which the strongest must succeed. Now this is precisely the case with reference to Repeal. Englishmen regard it as a dismemberment of

the Empire; and as their interest is to keep the Kingdom united, so they are hostile to separate Legislatures.—Ireland is England's right hand—her armies are recruited, and her navy manned in part from Ireland—Ireland is the best market for her manufactures. If Ireland were lost to her, her position of strength and security would be gone. She dreads the double loss, and she therefore resists Repeal. And it was under such impressions that Lord ALTHORP, while he admitted Ireland's right—still declared his determination to encounter civil war rather than sanction it. These are the reasons urged for thinking the Repeal of the Union almost impossible, so long as it is viewed as tantamount to separation.

What then is to be done to obtain general co-operation in seeking for a Repeal of the existing Act of Union? Our opinion ever has been, that it can be best effected by making the object of the agitation, a domestic parliament, independent in its action, but in a great measure limited in its functions to the management of our local affairs, while we still continue to hold a share in the general concerns of the Empire, by having Representatives in the Imperial Parliament.

We will quote a passage from a manuscript pamphlet, from the pen of the writer, about the period we are now entering on; namely, 1830—to show what his views are on this subject; and throughout the entire agitation, he never in any material degree diverged from them:—

“ I have no doubt that the reformed united Parliament
 “ will find that amidst the great national questions which
 “ should demand almost exclusively its attention, it is
 “ impossible the local and complicated concerns of the
 “ three kingdoms can be faithfully and closely protected.
 “ Each kingdom should have a separate and resident
 “ Legislature; the business of which should be, to attend

“ to the local affairs of its respective country,—the Im-
 “ perial Parliament still possessing a controlling power,
 “ so as to prevent the common interest of the empire
 “ being endangered. All questions of peace, war, taxation
 “ and treaties, might be exclusively the business of the
 “ Imperial parliament, to which each kingdom would
 “ send Representatives. All the local—the civil rights
 “ of Grand Juries—the management of popular edu-
 “ cation—the right of reforming Corporations—of
 “ settling the Church Establishment—of renewing
 “ titles and arranging all other local interests and details,
 “ should be vested in the local legislatures of the res-
 “ pective Countries. When the Parliament of England was
 “ first constituted, the concerns of that country were very
 “ few and very simple ; but at present, see how intricate
 “ they are. There are, for instance, the international
 “ affairs of Europe, in which England takes a promi-
 “ nent part ; the affairs of America in which she is con-
 “ cerned. There are the complicated affairs of the West
 “ Indies—of Canada, of the East Indies, and the other
 “ distant colonies. There are the intricate questions
 “ of the Commerce, Manufactures, and Finances of
 “ England, and there are the local affairs of
 “ these great kingdoms, differing from each other
 “ most essentially, in character, manners, and condition.
 “ How is it possible for one Parliament, sitting for a few
 “ months in the year, and deliberating at night, to watch
 “ over and manage with fidelity and correctness these
 “ varied interests ? Accordingly, we find local matters
 “ generally introduced at a late period of the Session. Ire-
 “ land has felt this neglect more than any other part of the
 “ empire ; more particularly, as there exists amongst the
 “ English members an ignorance of her local condition,
 “ and amongst the Irish members a supineness in pro-

“ tecting and advocating her interests. It is, therefore,
“ undeniable that a resident Legislature, in Dublin, for
“ the management of Irish affairs, would greatly promote
“ the prosperity of this country, and give more time to
“ the Imperial Parliament, for the consideration of Im-
“ perial questions, without, at the same time, loosening
“ the connexion ; but, on the contrary, making it firmer
“ and more complete.”

If it were understood that such an arrangement were to be embodied in a measure for repealing the Act of Union, there can be no question that existing prejudices would be removed, and that union of all classes, so essential to success, would be speedily accomplished. Without that union, success will be postponed to a distant period, unless a peculiar combination of circumstances occurs.

Having said thus much on this great question, the reader will be better prepared to enter with us on the history of O'CONNELL, connected with the political events subsequent to Catholic Emancipation.

Three objects occupied his thoughts in 1830. The first was the **REPEAL OF THE UNION**—the second **PARLIAMENTARY REFORM**, and the last, the remedying, as far as possible, Irish grievances in the existing Parliament.

The Repeal of the Act of Union was the predominant subject of his daily aspirations. From an early period of life, he cherished the hope that the Act which he saw carried by means so profligate and iniquitous—would not be permanent, and must be repealed. He never lost sight of it, and he more than once confessed his readiness to give up the pursuit of Emancipation, and adopt the national rallying cry of Repeal, if the nation would, throwing sectarian feelings aside, unite for that great object. But, however strong his own feelings might have been, no general movement could be hoped for while the

great body of the people was proscribed. When the question of Parliamentary Reform was agitated in England, and when the Irish nation despaired of justice without it, an attempt was made to put aside the Catholic question and unite all for Reform. The attempt failed, and the more difficult question of Repeal would have met a similar fate. Matters were, however, in 1830, in a different position. O'CONNELL always said that Emancipation would be simply an instrument for elevating the condition of his country. It was a means, not an end. The people agreed with him, and as soon as the Relief Bill became law, they at once turned their attention to the grand object, by attainment of which alone, prosperity, they believed, could beam on Ireland. The Press, the organ of popular feeling, began to descant on it. The newspapers were filled with disquisitions on the subject, and meetings were held in different towns throughout the country. O'CONNELL instantly took advantage of this feeling. He was determined that the lessons of agitation, long taught to Ireland, while justice was denied, should not be thrown away or be forgotten. But the project of Repeal was one that required great consideration. As an essential auxiliary, in the first place, union amongst all was absolutely necessary; while, to keep up the ardent enthusiasm of the people was equally indispensable. Without the people, nothing whatever could be done; and without a union of all the then antagonist forces, no impression could be made on Parliament in favor of Repeal. Here, then, was a most difficult achievement even for O'CONNELL. He had to infuse enthusiasm and ardour, without which all political agitation is unavailing, into the masses, by proclaiming national Legislative Independence; by depicting the glories of 1782; by showing how prosperity and happiness were

sure to visit all, through self-government, and only through self-government ; and finally, by demonstrating the very practicability, with perseverance, of attaining the great end in view. On the other hand, he had to remove the prejudices and the apprehensions of the Protestants of Ireland ; to convince them that their religious principles would be scrupulously respected ; that they, having more of worldly means, would be the greater gainers by the prosperity consequent upon self-government ; and above all, that separation could not possibly be the result of a domestic Parliament ; because such a result would be carefully guarded against—Such was O'CONNELL's task. Both objects, popular enthusiasm—and national union, he set about effecting simultaneously. He addressed himself, in the first place, to the Protestants. His letter to them is dated the first of January, 1830. In that letter, he called for an oblivion of past differences :—he preached to them conciliation ; he showed them that a domestic Parliament could alone sufficiently attend to the business of the nation ; and that they need feel no apprehensions about Catholic ascendancy. In the worst periods of religious despotism—in the days of MARY, the Irish Catholics, when in power, respected and sustained their Protestant countrymen—During the meetings for Emancipation, they never retaliated the vituperation they endured. In Catholic countries, O'CONNELL proceeded to observe, the greatest toleration existed ; and in the event of Repeal, all that would be looked for by the Catholics was a fair stage and no favor. Such was the manner in which he addressed himself to his Protestant countrymen, in furtherance of his great plan of conciliation. The time had not yet arrived to arouse the people for Repeal. There were several local abuses to which he was anxious first to direct their attention ; for, while

these marred the prospect of conciliation, it was not wise to create a popular agitation, on a subject in favor of which one section of the nation had not declared. In order, then, to give the people every facility for approaching the English Legislature, and testing its willingness and capacity for remedying the evils of Ireland, he took a house in Dublin, which he converted into a Parliamentary office, and appointed a Secretary, to receive there, all communications connected with the business of the country in Parliament. It was not possible to devise a better way of opening between Ireland and the British Legislature such a communication as must have resulted in good, provided the intention and the capability of legislating beneficently for us existed in the English Parliament.—As we proceed, we will see how little was, or could be effected by any such action, however organised, directed against the ignorance or prejudices of the English Representatives. In Mr. O'CONNELL's letter to the People of Ireland, dated the 7th January, 1830, he points out to them the various social and political evils for which he would endeavour to obtain redress in the House of Commons, of which he was now a member. He thus enumerates them:—

“1st. THE REPEAL of the SUB-LETTING ACT—I mean its total repeal. It is unjust in its enactments, and founded on the worst possible principle.

“2d. The repeal or modification of the VESTRY Bill, so that every person who pays parish cess shall have a vote at the Vestry; and that no man shall in future have leave to put his hands into the pockets of others in the name of religion.

“3d. The total alteration of the present Grand Jury system of jobbing. My plan includes a small annual acreable cess, to be calculated on the actual value of each

acre; and to be payable by the landlords, and deducted from the occupiers' rents, in the manner of the Tithe Composition Bill. The money when raised to be under popular control; that is, of a grand inquest, to be chosen by BALLOT, and to consist of two or more for each parish.

" 4th. I will apply for leave to bring in a bill, to declare that TRUTH is not a libel, or a crime. I say to *declare*—because, as a constitutional lawyer, I have always denied that there is any law to punish the printing and publishing of truth. There could not be any part of the common law, as it is called, directed against such publication. The genuine source of common law ceased before the invention of printing. There is no statute law—there is nothing but a star chamber decision—adopted and enforced by time-serving prerogative judges. This judge-made law has been the curse of England—and it is consolatory to perceive that everybody now admits that the most profligate, shameless tools of power, that the world ever saw, were the successive judges of England, *in bye gone times*—yet, how each set of them was, in its day, bepraised and beflattered!!! Verily, verily, JOHN BULL has been, and still is, a short-sighted animal.

" 4th. I shall promote an act to render the charitable institutions of Protestants, Dissenters, and Catholics perfectly safe; and to secure such property for its proper purposes, without costly litigation, or the expensive and clumsy machinery of renewal of trusteeships.

" 6th. My next object will be the correction of the enormous, insulting, and oppressive weight of corporation monopoly and exactions. I look for, in the first instance, the repeal of the new rules and regulations, as they are called, annexed to the Stat. 17th & 18th, chap. 5. These rules were intended to destroy popular influence in twenty-one principal corporations in Ireland.

“7th. The procuring an act to punish more efficaciously all attempts to levy illegal toll, and to reduce the amount of all legal tolls and define their nature—in fact, to abolish all tolls but those for which the owners give value or sufficiently compensate the public.

“8th. To extend the freedom of all the corporations to all resident householders; and to take away such freedom from all non-residents; so as to identify corporations with the inhabitants of the towns and cities.

“9th. Totally to abolish tithes in Ireland. The church lands are most abundantly sufficient to support the clergy of the Established Church, provided an equal distribution shall be made of them regulated in such a way as to give ample but not profuse incomes to all orders of that clergy. The abolition of tithe in Ireland is therefore an object not only of great national importance, but of obvious justice and propriety.

“10th. Totally to abolish all sinecure offices, and all pensions not earned by public services.

“11th. To diminish all such public salaries as have been raised during the war, or in consequence of the depreciation of the paper currency. The salaries of the judges have been twice raised in that way, and ought, in my opinion, be the first to be reduced.

“12th. The subject of law reform shall engross my most anxious thoughts, and my most strenuous exertions. This is, indeed, one of the first and leading purposes of my political life.

“13th. I intend to introduce a motion, to procure a draft or drafts, of an all-comprehensive code of *legislation* and *procedure*. The only expense to the public to be that of printing and distribution.

“14th. The present system of legal proceedings is replete with vexation, delay, enormous expense, and

much injustice. The time is come when the law should be rendered simple and plain—the mode of proceeding cheap, distinct and expeditious; and redress procured for every wrong, with equal facility by the poor man as by the rich. Injustice comes home to men's doors, and never sleeps. Justice should be equally accessible and permanent—crime is not regulated by stated adjournments; neither should the repression of crime—justice should take no vacation.

“ 15th. The principal points of detail for which I shall struggle, are these:—1st. The abolition of the irresponsible power placed in the most unsuitable hands of unpaid Magistrates. I truly believe, that there is not in Turkey any thing more radically despotic than the present system of Magisterial law—that is, despotic towards the poor. 2d. The abolition of the present system of special pleading; that being the most fertile source of falsehood, fraud and perjury. 3d. The abolition of the absurd distinctions between courts of law and equity. 4th. The abolition of all decisions on mere points of form; and compelling all decisions to be made on the merits only. 5th. The abolition of all technical rules, for the exclusion of evidence, and the compelling Judges to receive evidence from every quarter capable of giving it. 6th. The prevention of any suits being instituted, until both parties appear in proper person before the Judge, whenever such attendance can be had. It will thus be perceived that I am a thorough BENTHAMITE; and entirely concur in the benevolent plans of that illustrious man. This is not the place for further details of law reform; and perhaps I have extended this topic too much, as the simple profession of the BENTHAMITE creed shows my determination to endeavour to make the law rational, cheap, and expeditious.

“16th. My efforts in Parliament will be directed necessarily to render the law rational, cheap, and expeditious ; and thus to make every one's property more stable and valuable, and every man's life and liberty more comfortable.

“ There remains one great purpose of my parliamentary career—it is to obtain a radical reform of the House of Commons. My plan is comprehensive and simple—that every man should have a right to vote, with no exclusions but these three ; 1st, persons under the age of twenty one ; 2d, persons convicted of crime made punishable with this exclusion by the code ; 3d, persons declared incompetent by the verdict of a jury. This, in other words, can be called universal suffrage. The mode of voting should be by ballot. I take those two things to be essential, and not to be dispensed with or broken in upon by any qualification—universal suffrage and voting by ballot. The duration of Parliament should be limited to two years. This experiment has succeeded well in America. I would follow that example, though I am not wedded to it. But I never can qualify or abandon my view of universal suffrage and voting by ballot.

“ I have said nothing of the provision for the aged and destitute poor—and yet there cannot be any one subject more intensely interesting to my feelings and judgment—but the truth is, that the more I consider this important matter, the more does it appear to me to be surrounded with difficulties. The unfitness of the Irish jobbers to manage the machinery—the want of confidence in the wisdom or disinterestedness of many of the Magistracy—start up as formidable dangers, requiring much circumspection and the greatest caution. Again, the terrific immorality—the loss of all female notions of purity produced by the English poor laws. The measures inflicted by the cold hearted underhand managers, on the

wretched paupers themselves. The temptation to a more mad recklessness, of bidding for land, which would be induced, by a certainty of provision for the family from the parish, if the speculation failed. These, and many other considerations, make me to pause with apprehension, and to determine, not prematurely to commit myself to the details of a plan, which may drive chastity from the lower classes, and harden the hearts of the higher. I doubt, therefore, how far it may be safe to proceed during the present Session on this point, much as I approve of the principle, if it could find sufficiently sacred hands to manage and mould the details, for purposes of utility and genuine charity.

“ There is one great resource to which I think the poor of Ireland clearly entitled ; that is, a per centage on the incomes of absentees. Twenty per cent. on such income, would place more than one million sterling at the disposal of proper trustees for the Irish poor.

“ It is clear, that whatever is taken away from resident landlords, in the shape of a poor rate, would diminish their means to that extent of giving employment ; and thus take away from the industrious poor an independent livelihood ; whilst it gave the money which the labourer was thus deprived of, to persons, perhaps, merely indolent. Indeed, I much fear that the paupers generated on the estates of absentees, would render the landed property of the resident gentry, of little value ; and when the absentees' agents are, in general, and with a few amiable exceptions, such a harsh and unfeeling crew, that I am unwilling to give them any dominion over a poor rate. In short, the only present resource I see, is the per centage of one-fifth, at the least, on the incomes of the absentees.

“ This, however, is a subject of which I shall not lose

sight. It will be to me a sacred duty, to use all my faculties to discover the means of some resource for the Irish poor, which may be administered without crushing every germ of individual independence, and destroying every trace of private morality.

“ I am for the present silent on the most important of all topics—the repeal of the Union. I will not bring that subject before Parliament, until the combined wish of the Irish people shall demand the repeal, in a voice too distinct to be misunderstood, and too formidable to be trifled with.

“ It will take some time to reconcile the Irish people. We who were injured readily forgive, because forgiveness belongs to us. But those “ who did the wrong ” have not yet forgiven either themselves or us—“ *Recentibus odiis* ”—perfect conciliation is difficult ; but when these hatreds grown stale and antiquated, the kindlier feelings will have their natural play, and a community of suffering will produce in good time a combination of exertion.

“ It will be perceived that I do not intend to be an idle, though I may be an unprofitable servant. I certainly shall not placo myself in the attitude of regular opposition to the Ministry ; though I deem it right to add, that I am in my conscience most deeply convinced, that there never was an administration composed of more miserable materials than the present. It seems to me to be altogether a ministry without principle, system, sagacity, or information ; kept together by a reckless love of power and omolument, and incapable of appreciating the difficulties, and much less of discovering the suitable remedies, for the national distress and misery which are growing around us at every side.

“ I have the honour to be, fellow-countrymen,

“ Your devoted servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

Time has long since revealed to us how far the result of this experiment on an English Parliament was successful. Some of the reforms pointed out by O'CONNELL, in this letter, have been obtained—while many of the abuses he complains of still continue without relaxation or diminution. O'CONNELL's Grand Jury Plan proves how intimately acquainted he was with the system necessary to counteract the crying evils it produced. Many of the suggestions in his plan are still called for in our Grand Jury Law.

The particulars of his plan he thus set forth in a letter to the electors of Clare—

“ 1st. The appointment of a separate grand inquest for each barony, to consist of, at the least, thirteen.

“ 2d. The grand inquest of each barony to be composed, at least, of two persons from each parish in that barony.

“ 3rd. The two persons to be selected by secret ballot by the resident householders in each parish.

“ 4th. The election to take place in the presence of the high constable of the barony, and of the clergy of all persuasions resident in each parish. Their duty to be, to look to, and solemnly certify, the perfect fairness and result of each election.

“ 5th. The election to take place twice a year—the first early in January, the second early in June. The first to be a presenting grand inquest—the second an accounting inquest. The same person not to be on both.

“ 6th. The grand inquest for each barony to meet at a public sessions-house within the barony, and to be presided over by the assistant barrister.

“ 7th. The duties of the assistant barrister to be little more than preserving order and watching the presentments, that nothing against law may be charged on the barony.

“ 8th. The assessment to be on each acre in the barony, according to a graduated scale of value, to be cautiously made in the first instance, and revised every tenth or twentieth year.

“ 9th. My plan comprises a small but permanent assessment by the acre—to accumulate when not wanted—and the power to present to be limited within the assessment, until there shall be an accumulation made productive, as for example, in the saving banks.

“ 10th. My plan embraces also a county grand inquest, to consist of four from the inquest of each barony, to be chosen in the presence of the Assistant Barrister by secret ballot.

11th. My plan would leave to the County Grand Jury at the Assizes, and would even extend to common law, power to indict any barony where the roads were deficient for public utility. It would also enable the Assizes Grand Jury to indict any barony where an unnecessary road was presented for.

“ 12th. The indictment of the Assizes Grand Jury, either for defect or excess of road making, should in every instance, be triable by a Petit Jury, before the Judge, *without expense*.

“ 13th. The Assizes Grand Jury would, according to my plan, be deprived of any control over the raising or expenditure of any of the county money.

“ 14th. All the proceedings, under the new law, by the several grand inquests, to be public—no secrecy allowed.

“ 15th. The assessment to fall upon the landlord, and to be part of the rent. This will operate as it does in the present tithe composition cases.”

The great advantage of this plan over the present Grand Jury system is, that it is founded on the consti-

tutional principle of no taxation without representation. The existing law is based on a bad principle. The High Sheriff is an officer virtually appointed by the Judges of Assize, on the recommendation of their predecessors on circuit. This officer is irresponsible, and selects the Grand Jury as he pleases. The Grand Jury then nominate whom they choose amongst the highest rate-payers, to be associated with the Justices of the Peace, at Presentment Sessions. Thus, both bodies, having control over the local finances of the country, are appointed indirectly by the Crown; the payers of the taxes have no voice whatever in their nomination. Besides, these bodies discharge their duties necessarily in a hurried manner, owing to the shortness of their deliberations; and thus, though local taxation has of late years enormously increased, the great constitutional principle of representation is wholly excluded from the system, notwithstanding its vital importance to the community. Much was therefore to be done for Ireland, and great were the expectations of the people, that their faithful champion would, by his perseverance and commanding talents, effect, even in a foreign legislature, some amelioration in the condition of their country. On one subject alone, he dissented from the mass of the people, and some of their most steadfast friends; that was on the policy of a Poor Law for Ireland. However much persons may differ on the wisdom of the Workhouse system, in all its cumbrous details, the great body of the nation have never relinquished the righteous principle of providing for the destitute by compulsory taxation. On this subject, we have already expressed our own opinions; we allude to it here merely because of a discussion which occurred, during the year, regarding it, between Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. STAUNTON, who was a consistent and strenuous advo-

cate of Poor Law. With this exception, it was impossible for any man to personify public opinion in Ireland more completely than O'CONNELL. He went over to Parliament, to take his seat, not only as the member for Clare, but also as the true representative of Ireland. He went over with the blessings and good wishes of the people. The Catholic Charities of Dublin entertained him, previous to his departure, at a public dinner, in testimony of their confidence and gratitude ; and wherever he appeared, the people cheered him, in the fullness of hope, that his presence in Parliament would alter beneficially and speedily the complexion of its legislation.—Many were the speculations as to his success in the House of Commons ; his enemies confidently anticipating that the popular orator—the loud-toned agitator—would fail amongst the “ collective wisdom ” of the empire ; whilst his friends, on the other hand, calculated with confidence that his tact, good sense, and powerful eloquence, would bear him triumphantly through the ordeal. He did not long keep either his enemies or friends in suspense. He spoke on the first night of the Session, and proclaimed his conviction that without a radical reform of Parliament, no improvement in the condition of the people of either country could be achieved. He spoke about half an hour, with telling effect ; and was listened to without a whisper of interruption by the whole House. From the very commencement of the Session, his attendance was constant, and the part he took in the various discussions, most decisive of his political opinions.

It was evident, notwithstanding the rumour then afloat, of his acceptance of a vacant Sergeantcy, that he entered Parliament with no object of professional advancement. He proclaimed himself, in the face of Whigs and Tories, a Radical Reformer. He proposed, on the

question for transferring the franchise from East Retford, to another, and a new constituency, that the Ballot should be adopted; he thus, though of course his motion was rejected by a large majority, announced his opposition to both parties in the House, on the then pressing measure of Parliamentary Reform. He took the chair at a meeting of Radicals, at which HUNT and CARLISLE were the leading stars. In fact, he distinctly gave the world to understand that he belonged to the extrémé left of the Reform party, and that no half measures would satisfy him. Carrying with him, as he did, the support of the whole people of Ireland, possessing an unbounded influence over the Irish constituencies, his thus stepping out, and placing himself boldly at the head of the Reform agitation, was hailed with great gratification by the English Radicals, and undoubtedly gave the cause a strong onward impulse.—The leading Parliamentary friends of Reform kept aloof from the out-door agitation. Any association with HUNT and CARLISLE was deemed contamination. O'CONNELL, though he held these parties at arm's length, would not shrink from acting on his own principles. He had no such squeamishness, and he fearlessly came forward at the critical juncture. He became, in England, one of the most popular of its public men. Thus, within the short space of five weeks, had he established both in Parliament and out, a standing equal to that held by BROUGHAM, BURDETT, RUSSELL, and the other acknowledged friends of popular rights. At the Easter recess, he returned to Ireland, and there he then established the first of that famous series of Societies, which, proceeding onward, step by step, at last came to the celebrated Repeal Association of 1840. The one we now allude to was, the SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND; and though the Repeal of the Union was clearly one of its objects, still it was not brought prominently forward; as it was in-

tended that all friends of Ireland, differing on that question, should be members of this Association. Accordingly, we find that at the first meeting at which the Association was established, the chair was filled by EDWARD BERWICK, Esq., an earnest Reformer, and a zealous friend of his country, but no advocate for a Repeal of the Union. The objects of this new organization were detailed in the report drawn up by Mr. O'CONNELL, and which he prefaced with an eloquent, spirit-stirring Repeal oration, distinctly showing what his ultimate views as an agitator were, though the time had not yet arrived for their development. To trace from the beginning, the several stages of the political movement towards the great Repeal agitation, we give the programme of this new Society as follows:—

“First—The first object of the Society will be, to obliterate for ever all traces of party feuds and religious dissensions.

“Secondly—Another object should be, to endeavour to procure the repeal of the duty in Ireland on malt. It is due to Ireland, in point of common honesty, to repeal this tax.

“Thirdly—Another object should be, to procure the repeal of that odious and unjust tax on coals imported into Ireland. The continuance of this tax we deem to be a violation of the articles of union.

“Fourthly—Another object should be, to procure the repeal of the excise on paper in Ireland.

“Fifthly—Another object should be, to procure the total repeal of the mischievous Sub-letting Act.

“Sixthly—Another object should be, to obtain the repeal of the Vestry Bill, and to exonerate the people from parish cess.

“Seventhly—Another object of the Society should be, to obtain the abolition of the vexatious and oppressive system of Grand Jury laws.

“ Eighthly—Another object of the Society should be, to procure the abolition of tithes, and such an arrangement of the other enormous revenues of the Established Church, as should, whilst it diminished its overgrown emoluments, give ample compensation to the working and employed clergy of the establishment.

“ Ninthly—Another object of the Society should be, to protect the growers of tobacco from the threatened duty, which is calculated to annihilate the culture of that plant in Ireland—a culture, which, if encouraged, instead of being extinguished, would have given relief to great numbers of our now unemployed poor.

“ Tenthly—Another object should be, to put a period to corporate monopolies, and to extend corporate rights, franchises, and duties, to all the householders of corporate boroughs, towns, and cities.

“ Eleventhly—Another object should be, to resist the proposed increase of stamp duties; and in particular, to extend protection to the Irish Press, now threatened with annihilation.

“ Twelfthly—Another object of the Society should be, to resist the proposed introduction into Ireland, of the worst part of the Poor Laws; namely, the demoralising and degrading system of affiliation of, and parochial support for, bastards.

“ Thirteenthly—The Society should also make arrangements to afford legal protection to the poor and helpless, who may in anywise become victims of legal oppression from Magistrates, Corporations, Police, &c., &c.

“ Fourteenthly—The Society should also take into its most mature and deliberate consideration the entire scheme of Poor Laws, with a view to ascertain the propriety and practicability, or the unfitness, of introducing Poor Laws into Ireland.

“ Fifteenthly—It will be incumbent on the Society to discourage, and if possible, to terminate all secret and illegal Societies, all illegal oaths, Whiteboy outrages, insulting processions, and all crimes against the peace, good order, and morality of the people.

“ Sixteenthly—Another object should be, to assist in procuring a thorough reform of the present vexatious, expensive, and most uncertain system of pleadings, proceedings, and decisions in the Courts of Law and Equity; and the re-establishment of a cheap, expeditious, and intelligible code of procedure and jurisprudence.

“ Seventeenthly—Another object of the Society should be, to procure a complete and radical reform of all the defects in the present mode of representation in Parliament.

“ Eighteenthly—The Society should consider, with the deepest solicitude, the means of procuring such an universal combination of Irishmen, as may render the Repeal of the Union irresistible; and thus give to Ireland the blessings of a free and domestic legislature, connected with Great Britain by the golden link of the crown; but independent of all ministerial or undue control.

“ Nineteenthly—The subject of the education of the Irish poor, is one which must engross the most earnest solicitude of the Society, with a view to promote in every possible mode, the extension of literary and religious education; without in any respect interfering with the particular opinions or creed of any class or persuasion.

“ Twentiethly—The Society will feel it a most important duty, to extend encouragement, support, and protection, to the liberal and independent part of the Irish press.

“ Twenty-firstly—The advantage to Ireland, from the opening of the East India and Chinese monopoly, fur-

wishes another topic of much interest to the members of this Society.

“Twenty-secondly—The future liberation of the wretched slaves in our Colonies—the extension of literary and Christian knowledge to them—the amelioration of their present condition, are all topics of deep interest to every philanthropic individual, and cannot be inconsistent with the views of a Society composed of the warm-hearted and generous inhabitants of Ireland.

“ Twenty-thirdly—The formation of canals and railroads, the improvement of roadsteads and harbours, the encouragement of fisheries, and all ameliorations of a local or general nature, come within the scope and design of this society.

“ Twenty-fourthly—Every measure tending to encourage the agriculture—to foster and protect the manufactures—to extend the commerce—to increase the wealth—to secure the peace, and to establish the freedom of Ireland, come within the designs of “ The Society of the friends of Ireland, of all religious denominations.”

“ Lastly—The last, as well as the first, object of this Society, is to terminate party feuds—to extinguish religious animosities—to bury in perpetual oblivion all past injuries, insults, and offences—to extend harmony and conciliation throughout the land, and to combine Irishmen of every class and creed, in mutual benevolence and fraternal affection.”

Evidently, the great purpose of this Society was to bring together all the friends of freedom, and of Ireland, no matter what their creed ; in order to prepare them by union for the national effort contemplated by O'CONNELL. At the meeting at which the Society was formed, Mr. LAWLESS read a petition for the Repeal of the Union, which was ably drawn up, and received the unqualified appro-

bation of the Society ; thus showing that though Repeal was not the only, it was a principal object held in view. Some doubts were expressed as to the legality of the Society under the Algerine Act. It was evidently Mr. O'CONNELL's opinion that it could be put down by the Lord Lieutenant's proclamation ; but he met that contingency by stating, that there were four millions of Bank paper afloat in Ireland, and that if it was attempted to suppress the Society, he would recommend a run for gold. The Association of the Friends of Ireland met weekly, and its discussions became very interesting, gradually verging towards Repeal. A petition against the contemplated assimilation of taxes, gave Mr. O'CONNELL an opportunity of placing the entire working of the Union, with reference to international indebtedness, before the public. Nothing could be more masterly than his speech, and his petition on this branch of the Repeal question. He showed the injustice inflicted on this country ; how, while taxes to the amount of several millions were abolished in England, they were levied and increased in Ireland ; and how the only article of the Union, at all favorable to Ireland, was glaringly and grossly violated.

Thus, this Society, the forerunner of the Repeal Association, went on ; assuming daily, more and more, an anti-Union character. Mr. LAWLESS, who was a leading member, was pressing O'CONNELL to come out at once with the real question, for Irish advocacy and agitation ; and leave what were called "practical measures," to take care of themselves. O'CONNELL agreed with Mr. LAWLESS in principle. The difference between them was, the mode of effecting the object. The LIBERATOR was ever steadfast to the opinion, that conciliation was to be first tried. "To carry it (viz, Repeal), it is necessary," he said, "that conciliation and friendship should be firmly

established." There was nothing "short of crime and
"turpitude that he would not stoop to, to effect concili-
"ation, to have Irishmen combined together, as they
"ought to be. Let nothing be done rashly. Let them
"proceed, hour by hour, in a prudent course; let them
"do this, and as they were too good to be slaves, so no
"people were strong enough to keep them in provincial
"thralldrom."

In this spirit, Mr. O'CONNELL addressed, in the name of the Society, a letter to the people of Ireland, calling on all to unite: preaching to all peace, and good will; recommending to all harmony and affection; and desiring to promote amongst all benevolence and Christian charity. In this noble spirit, was the address framed. In this manner he gradually calculated on getting all to join for nationality; and had he not been subsequently thwarted, by hot-headed and over zealous friends, we are satisfied he would have succeeded. The Society was beginning to assume a formidable position, and the Government determined to crush it, under the Algerine Act. Accordingly, on the 24th of April, the Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND issued his proclamation, and the Society was suppressed, after having existed but for a few weeks, and having in that short time aroused public attention to the subject of Repeal. This procedure was not attempted by the Executive, until O'CONNELL had left Ireland, to discharge his Parliamentary duties, after the recess.

In the history of his early career in Parliament, one of the most remarkable incidents was his encounter with Mr. DOHERTY, and Lord F. L. GOWER, who was then Secretary for Ireland. It occurred on his motion respecting the Doneraile Conspiracy. In bringing the subject

before Parliament, he impeached the conduct of Mr. DOHERTY, for having suppressed the depositions at the first trials ; the subsequent production of which showing the omission originally of the tent scene, on which the case principally turned, was the cause of discovering the fabricated nature of the whole charge, and ensuring the acquittal of the other prisoners. This highly reprehensible conduct was brought before Parliament by O'CONNELL, in an exceedingly temperate statement. Indeed, the moderation of his language was alleged as a crime against him. His speeches in Ireland were contrasted with those he delivered in the House of Commons. The first were personal, defiant, and frequently uncourteous ; the last under-toned, mild, modified, and gentlemanly.— This was the only accusation that could be adduced against him ; and the only answer that was given to the charge against Mr. DOHERTY. That gentleman had some time previously been in the habit of taunting O'CONNELL, for not bringing forward his charge against him, in reference to the trials for the Borrisokane murders ; at which it was stated Mr. DOHERTY, as Solicitor-General, acted with improper partiality ; exercising his right of challenge, to set aside Jurors, merely because they were Catholics. O'CONNELL had frequently, out of Parliament, denounced the Solicitor-General's conduct at these trials, and had threatened to bring it before the House of Commons. In the meantime, it is said that DOHERTY procured from SHEIL, who was engaged at the trials, a written acknowledgment, that his conduct was quite fair and justifiable. Armed with this document, he kept continually challenging O'CONNELL to bring forward his charge. O'CONNELL was aware of the existence of the writing from SHEIL ; and not wishing to involve him in the transaction, and thus damage his

friend's popularity, he resisted all the taunts of Mr. DOHERTY, and abandoned his motion. The Solicitor-General thus obtained advantages by which he profited; for his collisions with O'CONNELL recommended him to persons in authority, and procured for him the elevated position of a Judge. To assail O'CONNELL was then the surest passport to place and office.

In the collision, he clearly had the advantage of Mr. DOHERTY. It was, however, by his celebrated reply, that complete victory was won. It was one of his best efforts in Parliament. We cannot avoid extracting from that speech a memorable passage—which has given the enduring title of “Shave beggar” to Irish Chief Secretaries. He replied in a bold tone to the attack made on him during the debate. One of the most conspicuous of his assailants was, Lord FRANCIS L. GOWER, the Irish Chief Secretary; this is the manner in which he disposed of that scion of nobility:—

“I perceive the Noble Lord(Lord L. GOWER) is about to leave the house. I beg of him to remain one moment. I will dispatch his Lordship first, though out of order (Hear, hear.) (Lord LEVESON GOWER returned to his seat.) I heard the speech of this Noble Lord without surprise or admiration. He took a haughty tone without cause, and a dictatorial manner without authority. First, indeed, he assented to the good taste of my Hon. and excellent friend the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. HUME.) My Hon. Friend certainly is not so fashionably neat as the Noble Lord. He is not a ruler of fashion—such an “*arbiter elegantiarum*” as the Noble Lord.—(Hear, hear.) He may not be so dainty or so courtly as the Noble Lord—but he has qualities which I advise the Noble Lord to admire, if he does not condescend to imitate them. He is honest—he is straight-forward—ho

hates a job—he loves economy of the public revenue—he despises the spoliators of the people's money—and he detects and exposes those peculators whom, in the present state of this House, he cannot punish. Such is my Honourable Friend. He deserves the respect of every honest man—the love of every good man (Hear, hear, and cheering.) He has, indeed, already crushed the pretensions of the learned member for, I really know not what borough. (Here a cry of Melbourne Port.) Aye, it may as well be Melbourne Port as any other. He has properly denominated that learned gentleman's speech by a word which is due to that gentleman himself, and by another equally opposite, which my Hon. Friend himself has added. He has called it “Salamander Buffoonery.” There never was a more appropriate designation (Hear, hear.) I now return to the Noble Lord. He has ventured to censure my conduct out of this House; out of this House, or in this House, I hold his censure at nought, nor do I undervalue it. He has taken upon himself, forsooth, to pronounce on my conduct. I have a right to retaliate upon him as a public man. For his taste, for his judgment, I have no regard—I rejoice that he disapproves of my conduct—I should be sorry he approved of it. He is mighty in his own conceit—he is little in mine. If he served my country, I would value him. But what has he done? What one act of his official life has been useful to Ireland? Where shall I find his services? He has condescended to accept the salary of an officer amongst us. I take it for granted that he has received the emoluments of that office.—I do not know how he has earned them. He has ornamented, by his presence, the apartments of Dublin Castle. But has he done any act of liberality?—has he promoted any one friend of civil or religious liberty?—has he, in short, raised himself into importance or consideration by

any one act of his administration? I deny that he has. What care I, then, for the unwise arrogance—the unfounded presumption—the overweening vanity of his censure. May I continue to deserve it. His office is, indeed, one of great promise. It is part of his public career. He is on the road (for such is the miserable destiny of this country) to still higher station. He is an apprentice in politics, and he dares to censure me, a veteran in the warfare of my country. His office is a mere apprenticeship. The present Premier was Secretary in Ireland—the present Secretary of state was Secretary in Ireland—so was the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. Their juvenile statesmanship was inflicted upon my unhappy country. I have heard that barbers train their apprentices, by making them shave beggars.—(Laughing.) My wretched country is the scene of his political education. He is the shave beggar of the day for Ireland (Cheering.) I have now done with the noble Lord—I disregard his praise—I court his censure—I cannot express how strongly I repudiate his pretensions to importance—and I defy him to point out any one act of his administration, to which my countrymen could look with admiration, or gratitude, or with any other feelings than those of total disregard. (Hear.) His name will serve as a date in the margin of the history of Dublin Castle—his memory will sink into contemptuous oblivion.”

At this distance of time, it is difficult to convey a correct notion of the triumphant feeling throughout Ireland, which the part taken by O'CONNELL in this discussion produced, or the high character as a Parliamentary debater which he acquired. The whole island was ringing with it. His reply sold more newspapers than any speech that was ever before delivered in the House, though that reply did not appear for some time after the debate, in con-

sequence of its suppression, in the first instance, by the London Press.

Notwithstanding the efforts made to crush O'CONNELL in the House of Commons—and no man was ever exposed to so many deliberate and preconcerted attacks—he defeated his assailants one after another; nay, when he was beset by DOHERTY, and NORTH, we think, together, he shook them off and floored the pair.

In May, of this year, he introduced a motion for Parliamentary Reform, in a speech of great power. The motion having for its object triennial Parliaments, universal suffrage, and vote by ballot, was lost by a majority of three hundred and nineteen to thirteen.

An opportunity presented itself to O'CONNELL, about this period, to turn the attention of the Irish nation towards Repeal. The Government had determined to assimilate the Stamp Duties on Newspapers with those in England; and thus, in the poorer country, effectually embarrass and cramp the Press. He did not permit the opportunity to pass; and while the excitement on the subject was at its highest, he addressed the people of Ireland, in order to prepare their minds gradually, but surely, for the agitation which was inevitably approaching. When he found the Government persevering in their determination to carry through the new system of taxation, he recommended a run on the banks for gold. However, the KING's death brought the session to a close, and no more was heard of the attempt to crush the Irish Newspapers by the Stamp scheme.

After the KING's death, O'CONNELL returned to Dublin. He was not honored with a silk gown; for the Government, with utter meanness of feeling, when they granted that distinction to five or six Catholic barristers of far inferior standing, passed him over, because he had

bearded them in their high places, and because he forced them to do some justice to his country. But he returned to Ireland with the esteem of all good men, and was received with affection and respect by the Irish people. He immediately assembled a meeting of his friends at the Parliamentary office, Stephen Street, where he reviewed the proceedings of the past session, in his usual lucid style, and prepared the country for the approaching general election. He was himself a declared aspirant, to the representation of the County of Waterford, against Lord GEORGE BERESFORD. Nothing could exceed the enthusiasm of the people of that county, on hearing that the LIBERATOR was to be a candidate. In the mean time, he paid a visit to his constituents of Clare. At the previous election, he gave a pledge to Major M'NAMARA, to resign in his favour at the next general election. He went to discharge that pledge. His intention of resigning Clare came upon the electors of that County by surprise; the announcement produced no trifling sensation. The history of the matter is shortly this. To avoid a contest in 1829, when he was sent back on a new writ, to be again elected, O'CONNELL pledged himself in writing to Major M'NAMARA, that if he gave him support on that occasion, and withdrew his own fair pretensions to the County, he would either form a coalition with him at the next general Election, or resign in his favor. This was an understanding which, being detrimental to the pretensions of O'GORMAN MAHON, who, in both these elections had done much service to the public cause, created a coolness between him and O'CONNELL. However, it appears pretty well authenticated now, that in a verbal conversation with O'CONNELL, in Dublin, Major M'NAMARA stated to him, that though he was most desirous of the LIBERATOR's return for Clare, he could not agree to any coalition, and that each must go to the

poll on a distinct and separate interest. This conversation O'CONNELL viewed as an implied relinquishment of the written understanding with Major M'NAMARA, and he considered himself at liberty to adopt what steps he pleased. Accordingly, a reconciliation between him and O'GORMAN MAHON was effected, and it was understood that he and the LIBERATOR were to be candidates at the general election for Clare. Major M'NAMARA, in the mean time, denied the conversation with O'CONNELL. The LIBERATOR was then in London; Mr. STEELE, upon Major M'NAMARA'S denial, went over to London and saw O'CONNELL, who felt indignant at the peremptory contradiction of his words. He dictated to Mr. STEELE the substance of the conversation which was denied by Major M'NAMARA. STEELE immediately afterwards returned to Ireland, and sent the memorandum to the Major, who again peremptorily denied that any such conversation occurred. Upon this, a message was delivered from Mr. O'CONNELL'S second son, MORGAN, who went with STEELE to the County of Clare, for the purpose of abiding by the issue. Major M'NAMARA declined to meet him, and stated, in his letter to Mr. STEELE, that he would insist on Mr. O'CONNELL'S pledge of his support being redeemed. Mr. STEELE then undertook, on the part of O'CONNELL, to withdraw his name; the intention then being to set up some other person in his place, who would afterwards resign; thus ensuring a second election, at which O'CONNELL could be chosen free from pledges. However, O'CONNELL determined that it should be, as Major M'NAMARA insisted on it, a *bona fide* resignation. He accepted the invitation for the County of Waterford, and proceeded to the County of Clare merely to redeem his pledge in form. This exasperated the people greatly. They could not endure the notion of O'CONNELL retiring, to give place to Major M'NAMARA.

O'GORMAN MAHON, who was very popular in the county, was considered by his friends to have been thrown over board. There is no doubt whatever, that great jealousy existed in his mind; considering the part he had taken in 1828 and 1829, he certainly deserved the utmost attention and support.

O'CONNELL was most enthusiastically received in Clare; a procession in his honor was formed on his approach to Ennis, and he took his place in a triumphal car, surrounded by the people. It was arranged by O'GORMAN MAHON's friends, that he should, notwithstanding the existing jealousy, meet the LIBERATOR, and welcome him to Clare. A place for meeting the procession was fixed upon. But, from some cause or other, the procession had passed on, before O'GORMAN MAHON arrived at the spot appointed. He then proceeded in his carriage, attended by a large crowd of his supporters, to overtake the procession. He reached it. His followers wanted to pass it, in order to give him precedence. This was resisted by O'CONNELL's friends, and a collision took place. Danger to life, nay, to O'CONNELL's life, was apprehended. The scene gave rise to intense anxiety; for it was, in the excitement which existed, difficult to foresee the termination. In the *melee*, O'GORMAN MAHON got on O'CONNELL's car. The collision then looked alarming. O'GORMAN MAHON and his friends asserted that the whole thing originated in a mistake; and in the mad folly of his party insisting, against his will, on heading the procession. O'CONNELL, on the other hand, felt convinced, seeing what had occurred, that personal injury was intended him. When O'GORMAN MAHON attempted to ascend the platform of his car, he took him by the collar, and addressing him, exclaimed—"I am as prepared to face death as yourself, and here is for it;"

and he flung him back amidst the crowd. Everything looked now like a bloody catastrophe; but on the entreaty of his friends, O'CONNELL retired to a distance from the platform, and O'GORMAN MAHON's carriage, drawn by the people, then passed on, and reached Ennis before the procession. O'CONNELL afterwards stated in private, and in public, in 1833, that O'GORMAN MAHON had a design upon his life, and STEELE published the same opinion. O'GORMAN MAHON was a powerful, athletic man; yet O'CONNELL used to say, that in the excitement of that day, he felt as if he were a mere child in his own grasp; and he flung him from the car with as much ease as if he had a boy to deal with. We confess, after giving the subject every consideration, we cannot see this unfortunate affair in the same light as the LIBERATOR did. O'GORMAN MAHON was then a chivalrous being—rash and impetuous, of high pretensions, and proud of the part he had taken in winning Emancipation—for, as all know, the Clare election accelerated that event. His vanity may have induced him to meet O'CONNELL at the head of his supporters; and, probably, he had no objection, under the influence of wounded feelings, to show O'CONNELL, that in Clare he was as popular as himself. But that he sought to come into mortal conflict with him, or do him personal injury, we cannot believe. We judge of the matter from the face of the transaction. We are not acquainted with any secret history in reference to it. Having, however, under all the circumstances, risked such a collision, was, to say the least of it, a rash and perilous procedure.

O'CONNELL, having taken his leave of the men of Clare, proceeded to the County of Waterford, to oust the BERESFORDS from their strong-hold. Though the people of Clare thus lost him as a Representative, no power and

no engagement could deprive them of the glory of having won Emancipation. To Clare that triumph especially belongs. In the town of Ennis, and other towns through which Mr. O'CONNELL passed, on his way to Waterford, he was received with the most unbounded joy. Next to the Clare contest, the struggle in Waterford was the most important Ireland ever witnessed. The LIBERATOR came there, locally a stranger, to route the BERESFORDS from their political possessions; and in proportion to the greatness of the enterprise, was the welcome he received. He was entertained at a public dinner, at which the present Sir HENRY WINSTON BARRON presided. At that dinner, he preached, powerfully, union amongst all classes of Irishmen, for the purpose of achieving Domestic Legislation. The two ideas—of conciliation and co-operation, were always present to his mind; and though, in the history of the human kind, no man was ever treated with more rancour, or received more abuse, still, he always cherished the belief that he would be instrumental in bringing about this wished-for national co-operation. He failed in this. But his failure does not lessen the merit of his exertions to effect it.

His canvass through the County of Waterford was most successful. Of his election there was no doubt. Whether his influence was sufficient to take in a second Catholic member, was the question; and if it were—was it prudent to make the attempt; seeing that his object was, the union of all creeds, for a great national purpose. The election came on. Mr. O'CONNELL, Lord GEORGE BERESFORD, and Mr. WYSE, were proposed as Candidates.—Lord GEORGE BERESFORD was personally well liked, and his family influence was all-powerful. It was considered most probable, that the constituency would satisfy their political feelings by returning O'CONNELL; and

promote their personal interests, by supporting Lord BERESFORD. It then became a question whether, under the circumstances, the turmoil and bitterness of an Election contest should be provoked. Mr. O'CONNELL, having satisfied himself that only one of the two Catholic Candidates could be returned, on the day of the nomination tendered his resignation; but Mr. WYSE would not allow such an issue to an election that was watched with so much interest. He cut the matter short by resigning himself. It is now difficult to decide on the wisdom of this move on the part of O'CONNELL. It is quite certain that now-a-days no such compromise would be tolerated. To defeat the BERESFORDS would be a primary object.— However, O'CONNELL having signified his intention to resign, there was no alternative, and Mr. WYSE most honorably withdrew. Mr. O'CONNELL became member for Waterford at an eventful crisis. The French Revolution had terminated. CHARLES THE TENTH was driven from his throne, because he sought to crush the liberties of the French Press and People. The populace, who had won this victory, retired quietly to their homes, and allowed the privileged class to carry out the necessary changes. This moderation and success won Reform for England. The cup of public discontent was full, and the French Revolution caused it to overflow. But the change was brought about constitutionally, and, therefore, slowly. At the period of the French Revolution, the leading Reformers of England were laggards. BROUGHAM and BURDETT and RUSSELL were either lukewarm, or not determined to go the necessary lengths. COBBETT, who knew well how matters stood, addressed O'CONNELL a letter, stating to him that he alone was the man in whom the radical reformers had confidence, and calling on him to be as true to his own principles in the new Parliament as in the last.

Mr. O'CONNELL, soon after the Waterford election, retired to Darrynane. He had previously, during the Assizes, presided at a great public dinner given in Cork, by the constituency, to Dr. BALDWIN, candidate at the previous election for that City. It was from Darrynane were dated those celebrated letters on Repeal, which effectually aroused attention to that great question, and gave it an impulse something similar to what it acquired after the Corporation discussion in 1843.

The times and the temper of the people were peculiarly suited for a favorable reception of those letters. The minds of men were then concentrated on the recent events in France—and on the passing revolution in Belgium.—Meetings were held in the chief towns throughout Ireland; in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, to congratulate the French people on their success. Enthusiasm and energy were abroad; and the love of liberty, which is an innate sentiment of mankind, began to be practically developed in every direction. Such was the moment O'CONNELL selected for opening to the Irish nation the history of the Union—the iniquities by which it was accomplished—the injuries it inflicted—the paralysis of the national energies which it was every day producing—the destruction of the national resources—the annihilation of the national prosperity it was effecting, and the absolute necessity there was to save the country, by making a national effort for REPEAL. The question was warmly taken up by the people. O'CONNELL's able letters were read with absorbing interest by all classes. Every thing looked favourable for the glorious achievement by means of moral agitation. England was all alive, seeking for Parliamentary Reform; and national freedom appeared the fashionable pursuit. It is to be lamented that subsequent events, to which we will come by-and-by, caused the suspension

of an agitation which bid so fairly for success. The apathy and indifference which this afterwards produced, were not, notwithstanding O'CONNELL's earnest efforts, overcome until 1843.

On leaving his retirement at Darrynane, in October of this year, Mr. O'CONNELL was entertained at a great public dinner at Cork. The manner in which he was received during the journey from Darrynane, until his arrival in Cork, was far beyond any thing he had ever before experienced. On the roads, as he passed, crowds of the peasantry met him, cheering for REPEAL, as his carriage drove by. In Cork, his reception was equally gratifying. The dinner was attended by his ardent and sincere supporters, during this struggle, all emulous to join him in his renewed efforts for his country. The same reception awaited him at Kanturk—at Youghal and at Waterford. In fact the whole South of Ireland was in a ferment in favor of the New Agitation. It was already beginning to attract the attention of the English Press. By all it was admitted to have assumed a formidable aspect—by some it was looked upon with undisguised apprehension—and by others it was written of after the fashion of the following article, which we take from a London Daily Paper then in high repute:—

“The people of Ireland seem determined, if possible, to carry their object—we mean the repeal of the Union Act. Perseverance effects much; and it was by the determined perseverance of the friends of Catholic Emancipation that a measure which for so many years was insidiously supported by some of the most talented ministers this country ever knew, but which failed, because they wished its failure, was at length carried. It was left for the Duke of WELLINGTON to press it on—to vanquish all opposition—and at the word of command, the

Catholics were emancipated. We really were amazed at the time—and the recollection still tickles our fancy—at the vacillation of man. When his Grace commanded his troops, who, before he took the command, were opposed to Catholic liberty, all on a sudden they were seized with the fraternizing system; they saw nothing but fraternity in the Catholic countenance—they voted for the measure of emancipation, and they then eagerly embraced their new brother-in-law. It was the union of religion and the bond of good fellowship. Those who saw nothing but the fires of Smithfield, when PITT and ADDINGTON, and PERCIVAL lived, discovered all at once that the light was “light from heaven,” and that Catholics were human beings. Such is the progress of intellect—such the march of justice. There is now another boon to be granted—another act of justice to be done to Ireland. The Union Act must be repealed—at least, so say the united Irish people; for they are all agreed on that point. The sentiment most certainly is general—even the Lord Mayor of Dublin, and all the most influential Irish gentry, are strong supporters of the Repeal. Meetings have already been held, and are about to be held in every county in Ireland, to petition the British Parliament upon the subject, and a confident hope is entertained that the act will be repealed. We must confess that we were never friendly to the Union—it was a measure, in our opinion, least calculated to benefit Ireland; and the experience of thirty years has confirmed us in that opinion. It will be an act of grace which shall return to Ireland her Parliament; and consequently confer on the people that right which was wrung from them thirty years since—the right of petitioning their own Legislature against the grievances which afflict the country.—The Repeal will return to the bosom of the country,

the absentee landlords ; it will give a character to Ireland, of which she was deprived when the measure was carried. Besides, the situation of that part of the United Empire, is quite different now from what it was when the Act passed—then, the people were clamorous for Emancipation ; now, they have it. The question, therefore, is, whether the Parliament of Ireland will be more obnoxious in 1830, than it was in 1800—Whether, the people having gained their chief object, Catholic Emancipation, it will be for the interest of the British Government to continue to drag a few Irish members across the Channel, under the pretext of protecting the interests of the whole population of Ireland ; when, in fact, that very population tells the Government fairly they are not represented. We have had plenty of squabbling about liberating the Catholics—battles enough, in all conscience, because Government would not liberate—and, lo and behold ! at length comes the mighty conqueror, and at his nod they are free ! The same nod may bid the opposers of the Repeal of the Union vote in its favour ; for some of these gentlemen have mighty convenient consciences. The question of Repeal is not one which relates to religious faith—and upon that subject we have already given an opinion—but it does embrace the happiness or misery of a splendid and generous and fine race of people—of a people who have shed their best blood in defence of the empire ; whose hospitality is proverbial, and whose attachment to the KING is sincere. They now ask to be fairly represented ; and they tell, or rather will tell, the KING and United Parliament, that at present they are unrepresented—that the Union has robbed them of their gentry, and has shut the door against complaint. The appeal, we think, will be irresistible ; it will be the appeal of a suffering nation to

a liberal and generous KING ; and whether the Duke of WELLINGTON has or has not made up his mind on the subject, we hope, for the sake of Ireland, that as the happiness of the whole is centred in having a Legislature of their own, the appeal will not be made in vain."

O'CONNELL, after meeting his constituents at Waterford, proceeded to Dublin. Here he continued the Repeal agitation with great earnestness. Every where—at public meetings—Charity dinners—Parish gatherings—Political entertainments—the Union and its results formed the leading topic of discussion. The national mind became centred on the question with more intensity and fixedness every day.

At this crisis, it was contemplated to form an Anti-Union Association, in Dublin ; or a Society for Legislative Relief. There was one small preliminary meeting, and it was intended to hold a larger one, to determine whether the Association should assume the title of Anti-Union Association. The Irish Government took alarm, and immediately issued, in the name of the LORD LIEUTENANT, who was absent from Dublin, and with whom there was no time to have communicated—a Proclamation, declaring the existing or proposed Association illegal. This was the act of Sir HENRY HARDINGE, then Chief Secretary. Mr. O'CONNELL immediately called on the people to obey the official mandate. But at a dinner, at which he presided in Dublin, for the benefit of the Clondalkin Free Schools—he denounced the Proclamation as illegal—being issued without the personal authority of the Duke of NORTHUMBRLAND, who was then Governor-General. He charged the act on Sir HENRY HARDINGE, and took occasion to animadvert severely on the Secretary's conduct. To this Sir HENRY HARDINGE was not disposed quietly to submit, and a hostile message

to O'CONNELL followed. The following correspondence, which appeared from the friend of Sir HENRY HARDINGE, in the *Dublin Evening Post*, will explain the transaction, and the issue :—

“ MR. EDITOR—The following passages are to be found in a speech of Mr. O'CONNELL's, published in the *Freeman's Journal* of this day, the 23rd inst.

‘ The Hon. and Learned Gentleman next alluded to the decay of despotism in Europe, and adverting to the late abominable Proclamation, spoke as follows :—In the beginning of this week, you saw an English soldier, a hireling scribe at the Castle, writing down the freedom of our country. I had not before given my opinion upon that infamous act—I remained silent, until I had counselled the People and obtained their pledge to obey the law—to keep the peace. Having succeeded in obtaining that promise, I knew the people would rather die than violate it. I shall now, then, speak my mind upon the act of this English soldier—(Hear, hear). I arraign that paltry, contemptible little English soldier, who had the audacity to put his pitiful and contemptible name to an atrocious POLIGNAC Proclamation—(Loud cheers)—and that too in Ireland ; in my country—in this green land—the land of BROWNLOW—the country of GRATTAN—now in his grave —(Hear)—the land of CHARLEMONT, and of the 70,000 Volunteers—the heroes of the immortal period of '82—(Cheers). In that country, it is, that a wretched English scribe (*a chance child of fortune and of war*), urged on by his paltry, pitiful lawyerlings—put his vile name to his paltry proclamation, putting down freemen (Cheers). I would rather be a dog, and bay the moon, than the Irishman who would tamely submit to so infamous a proclamation. I have not opposed it hitherto, because that would implicate the People, and give our enemies—the English

Major-General and his lawyerling staff—a triumph.— (Hear, hear). But I will oppose it ; and that, too, not in the way that the paltry castle scribe would wish—by force. No ; Ireland is not in a state for repelling force by force. Too short a period has elapsed since the cause of contention between Protestants and Catholics was removed—too little time has been given for healing the wounds of factious contention, to allow Ireland to use physical force in the attainment of her rights or the punishment of wrong.

... ..
 ‘ I never will submit to such audacity ; and I here premise that I will never cease to pursue the—miscreants shall I call them ?—no, that would be too hard a phrase ;—but I will call them the despicable, base, miserable, paltry creatures, with bad heads and worse hearts, who issued that nefarious proclamation, (Cheers)—in that place where, and at the period when, reason shall be listened to. I do not mean to say that I shall be attended to in the rotten, boroughmongering Parliament. But I trust the day is not far distant, when reason shall be heard ; and when fine and imprisonment shall mark the foul conduct of Secretary Major-General Sir H. HARDINGE—(Cheers). He usurped the prerogative of the LORD LIEUTENANT alone ; greater, I admit, than any that the KING is invested with—and I have no hesitation in stating that for this he is indictable in law.

‘ It makes the will of one man the law. Now, simple despotism is precisely the same ; so that we have in Ireland, in the person of an English Lord, a despot the most complete in Europe. The law which constitutes this despot, is a barbarous act of military despotism—an outrageous exhibition of martial tyranny—the force of the cannon, and the bayonet, and the sabre—dragoons and military—horse, foot, and all, against reason, right, and

justice. It is tyranny in its blackest, foulest shape. The insolent Englishman, who used it—and in its use infringed the law—may talk of his prowess—may boast of his duelling propensities. Oh! would to God! the sacred cause of freedom were between us—in some as sacred conflict, where the lover of his country and of Christian charity and peace, might appear with honour—(Cheers.) My blood boils when I see a wretched English scribe, dare, in the face of Heaven, to trample down the people of Ireland with his iron heel. And is this to continue? If I live it cannot be—it cannot be—(Cheers)—It is an audacious insult to this country to have framed such an Act of Parliament.'

... ..
 " In consequence of these passages I received the following note from Sir HENRY HARDINGE :—

' No. I.

' Secretary's Lodge, Oct. 23, 1839.

' MY DEAR D'AGUILAR—I enclose you the *Free-man's Journal*, in which you will perceive that Mr. O'CONNELL has used expressions towards me, which proceeding from a person who may be supposed to have the claims of a gentleman, if I were to insult him, entitles me therefore to call upon him—first, to ascertain whether he avows those expressions; and next, whether he is disposed to maintain them; affording me in such case the remedy which one gentleman has a right to expect from another. If Mr. O'CONNELL refuses to give me this satisfaction, it will be for the world to judge how far that individual, who chooses to screen himself from the usual consequences of insulting another, can be justified in making use of intemperate language, which would be grossly offensive, proceeding from the lips of any gentleman.

' I am, my dear D'AGUILAR, your's very truly,

' H. HARDINGE.

' P. S.—Mr. O'CONNELL will probably not be at home at half-past 12 o'clock, and therefore I beg of you to call on him as early as you can.

' I shall be at the Castle at one o'clock.'

" Having in pursuance of the request contained in this note, waited upon Mr. O'CONNELL at his own house in Merrion-square, I read the contents of Sir HENRY HARDINGE's note distinctly to Mr. O'CONNELL, and pointed out the obnoxious passages in the report of the speech, which Mr. O'CONNELL then perused. Mr. O'CONNELL disavowed the expression " a chance child of fortune and of war ;" and then entered into a general conversation on the subject. I requested Mr. O'CONNELL to put whatever he might have to say in connexion with this particular matter, in *writing*, in order that I might run no chance of misrepresenting him in any way ; more especially, as I had no alternative but to require a disavowal of those expressions which were offensive to Sir HENRY HARDINGE, and which are recited in the passages above, or to demand that satisfaction which was due from one gentleman to another.

" Mr. O'CONNELL then wrote the following note, to which I replied in writing likewise, as will be seen at the foot of it.

' No. 2.

' Mr. O'CONNELL does not feel himself called on either to avow or disavow anything attributed to him by the public Papers. At the same time, that if any allegation of *fact* be pointed out to him—attributed to him—which is not true, he will readily either disavow the assertion, if untruly attributed, or contradict and atone in every way possible for the allegation, if he made use of it.

' No man living is more ready than Mr. O'CONNELL to

disavow and atone for any error in point of fact, which he may have fallen into.

‘ Mr. O’CONNELL will not receive any kind of communication with reference to such a mode of proceeding, be the consequences of such disclaimer what they may ; repeating his readiness to retract and atone for any fact alleged by him not founded in proof.

‘ He spoke of Sir HENRY HARDINGE in his *public* capacity, as an instrument of despotism. He did not say one word of him in his *private* capacity.

‘ As a public man, he did speak of Sir HENRY, as he would of any other man who trampled on the liberties of Irishmen—and he must say, that fighting a duel would be a bad way to prove that Sir HENRY was right or Mr. O’CONNELL wrong.

‘ No. 3.

‘ Having received this from Mr. O’CONNELL’s hand, and read it in Mr. O’CONNELL’s presence, it only remains for me to say, that this is not the disavowal of the expressions required by Sir HENRY HARDINGE—and I do therefore, in that gentleman’s name, call upon Mr. O’CONNELL for that satisfaction, for his gross and intemperate language, which is due from one gentleman to another.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL having heard me read this aloud, then said ‘ refused already’—but added in his own hand writing, ‘ In addition to the passage I marked as disavowed, (*viz.* a Chance Child of Fortune and of War) I disavow using the words ‘ Hireling Scribe.’

“ GEORGE D’AGUILAR.”

The Proclamation did not deter O’CONNELL from proceeding with the agitation. The Anti-Union Society was scarcely suppressed, when he formed a new Association, called the “ Irish Volunteers, for the Repeal of the Union.”

This Association was immediately suppressed by Proclamation. Public Breakfasts, at which the question was discussed, were then got up. The breakfasts continued to be attended every week during the remainder of the year, at HOLMES' Hotel; and though they were Repeal meetings of a very determined character, they most effectively baffled the Government, and escaped the provisions of the law. Mr. O'CONNELL was absent in Parliament during most of these meetings. On his return, in December, he attended; and one of the most brilliant speeches he ever delivered, was made at the last breakfast meeting held in 1830. It was in this speech that he denounced the Government of Lord GREY, for his threatened coercion, and christened SPRING RICE, by the epithet "small beer."

The agitation for the Repeal of the Union had thus assumed so formidable an aspect, that the Aristocracy, Whig, and Tory, became apprehensive. The Duke of LEINSTER took the lead, in a counter movement; and the celebrated LEINSTER DECLARATION was got up.

The following is the document, which made so much noise at the time. We attach the signatures which appeared to it on its first publication. When it was again published in May, 1831, it was far more numerously signed. This declaration was drawn up by Mr. PIERCE MAHONY. How idle were the fears and expectations it embodied, time has shown:—

"We, the undersigned, feel ourselves called upon at the present juncture, to declare our anxiety for the permanence of the British Connexion, and our conviction that the political discussions which have recently commenced upon the question of a "*Repeal of the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland,*" will (if persevered in) be productive of consequences highly prejudicial to

the interests of Ireland, and the empire, of which she forms so important a part.

“ We are of opinion that such Repeal is a measure totally impracticable; and we are convinced that the Agitation of it is peculiarly injurious to the prosperity of Ireland, by diminishing that public confidence in her tranquillity, without which, it is vain to expect that capital or enterprise can largely or beneficially be directed to the cultivation of her resources, and the profitable employment of her people.

“ At the same time that we express these sentiments, we deem it a duty to declare our conviction, that it is essentially necessary to the well being and tranquillity of Ireland, that the attention of the Imperial Parliament should be immediately called to her condition; and its desire for her welfare be practically manifested, by the speedy adoption of measures calculated to ensure her general and permanent improvement.

Leinster,	Robert Latouche,
Portarlington,	Thomas White, Woodlands,
Enniskillen,	J. H. North, M.P.
Rosse,	Anthony B. Blake,
De Vesce,	Charles Morgan, Knt.
Blaney,	Henry Smith, Annesbrook,
Poer, Tuam,	W. H. Curran,
Richard, Killaloe,	Philip Crampton,
Thomas, Ferns,	Robert Roe,
William Fitzgerald,	Fras. Sadlier, S.F.T.C.D.
Frederick Ponsonby, M.P.	John Kingston James, Bart.
John Pomeroy,	Thomas M'Kenny, Alderman,
John Torrens, Archdeacon of	W. L. Guinness,
Dublin,	J. J. Bagot, Castle-Bagot,
Harcourt Lees, Bart.	Henry Hamilton,
Samuel Kyle, Provost T.C.D.	Richard Cane,
F. Blackburne, Sergt.-at-law,	George Hamilton,
J. L. W. Naper, Loughcrew,	Dominick O'Reilly,
Gilbert Austin, Clerk,	Pierce Mahony,
George Evans, Portrane,	David Mahony,
John David Latouche,	George Studdart,

John Macmahon,
James Pim,
Nathaniel Sneyd,
Patrick Waldron,
Robert Orr,

Wm. James Napier,
Fred. W. Mullins, Beaufort,
James Jackson,
Hugh Barton."

The High Church or Orange party did not join in this demonstration. But in a distinct document, they declared their determination to uphold the Union. In Parliament, too, very strong expressions were made use of by the leading men at both sides, indicative of their hostility to the project of Repeal. In fine, the utmost alarm prevailed amongst the aristocratic and official circles. But O'CONNELL'S popularity went on increasing. On his return to Dublin, from Parliament, he was honored with a public entry, on a most magnificent scale; far exceeding in grandeur any similar compliment paid the most popular Viceroy. The reception which the Marquess of ANGLESEY, a few weeks afterwards met, illustrates this observation. He was at one time the most popular of Viceroys. He was now re-appointed under the Whig Government. But he came, associated in the popular estimation with DOHERTY, the enemy of O'CONNELL, and his reception was anything but flattering.

The new Lord Lieutenant, was scarcely installed, when he took steps against the Agitation. The trades of Dublin, comprising Orangemen and Catholics, determined to present an address to the great advocate of a Domestic Parliament; and a day was appointed for going in procession to O'CONNELL'S house. The procession was prohibited by a Proclamation; the fiat, by O'CONNELL'S earnest advice, was obeyed, and the procession did not take place. A deputation, however, of three from each trade, was appointed at his suggestion, to wait on Mr. O'CONNELL, with the address. This was done; and though banners and other insignia, which each trade originally intended

to have carried, were not allowed, in obedience to the Proclamation, still, the assemblage in the streets of Dublin, to see the deputations proceed to Mr. O'CONNELL, were as great as they would have been if the procession were permitted to march as at first designed. Such was the paltry system adopted in those days to suppress the expression of public opinion in Ireland. But it signally failed. The more O'CONNELL was opposed, the more he triumphed.

In gratitude for his past services, and in sustentation of him, in his present all-important and expensive career, the People of Ireland determined that the subscription to defray his great expenditure should be annual. The Citizens of Cork took a leading part in its organization, and we will often have to testify to their zeal in this respect.

There is not in the annals of nations, or in the history of individuals, so noble an instance of public gratitude—so high a testimony to worth and patriotic services, and so ample a proof of the national love of justice as the O'CONNELL ANNUITY. When Ireland saw how necessary it was for her interests that Mr. O'CONNELL should abandon his professional pursuits, and devote himself, in and out of Parliament, exclusively to her cause, it was at once determined, with spirit and cheerfulness, to compensate him for the loss of his professional emoluments, and sustain him in the increased outlay which the national interests entailed. The writer of this MEMOIR, was, from the commencement, intimately mixed up with the collection of the ANNUITY. He is proud to think, and will be pardoned if he says, that, for years, by the publication of an annual Address to the People, he was instrumental in extending the organised system of collection throughout the country, which was alone ne-

cessary readily to ensure the national response in a manner generous as well as just. He can aver, then, of his own knowledge, that the O'CONNELL Annuity, from first to last, was a spontaneous tribute of affection to the man, and a testimony of their love of justice on the part of the Irish People. With of course, some occasional exceptions, intrusive solicitation was never employed.

The annuity was principally paid by the Clergy and the middle class, who were themselves the originators of it. It was a noble undertaking, honorable to the people and their Leader. Of course, by his enemies, it was held up before the world in an odious light; and the most degrading epithets were employed in its description. The LIBERATOR himself shrunk, at first, from all reference to it; so did his family. It was considered a delicate topic. We could never view it with any such feelings. It was, in our opinion, the highest testimony to his worth, talents, and services, that could be afforded. It proved, in a substantial form, that they were appreciated by every individual Irishman. It was the best and surest index of the national sentiment. O'CONNELL was, as he used himself to say, the paid advocate of his country.— Well! what higher position could he occupy? Where is the man who before him filled, as he did, a similar situation? Will such a man ever again arise? The public will accept the services of ordinary men, and cheer them in their course. But he, indeed, must be one of long-tried and exalted patriotism—of commanding talents—of great intellectual energy, who will so impress a nation with his necessary value, that, year after year, almost every individual would be ready to sustain him in the elevated position of a tried and trusted National Advocate. It is not probable that a similar combination of circumstances will again arise, to demand an equal exer-

tion of national virtue. O'CONNELL was peculiarly situated. He never was wealthy; on the contrary, he was considerably in debt, from the commencement of his career. He married young, and without a fortune. He had a large family. Holding the position before the world, and in his profession, which he occupied, he was, unavoidably, an expensive man. Besides, he had total disregard of money, whenever it was necessary to assist a friend—to support a charity—or to sustain the popular cause. The consequence was, as we have already seen, he got entangled in pecuniary difficulties; and though he was receiving a large professional income, and had acquired considerable property by the death of his Uncle, MATRICE, in 1825, and by his Uncle, Count O'CONNELL, in 1834—he obviously was not in circumstances to surrender his profession, and devote himself without public sustentation to political life. Place and professional dignity, he, fortunately for his country, rejected. His services could not be dispensed with by Ireland; and she tendered him in the noblest manner the means which enabled him to abandon, for her sake, a splendid professional income and splendid professional prospects. In our opinion, the tribute was far more acceptable and gratifying, than if it came through the channel of a Parliamentary vote. It would then be more or less the act of the Government; or, at best, the act of a few. The GRATTAN grant of £50,000, was a noble tribute, paid a great man by the Parliament that so often witnessed his triumphs. The half a million voted to the Duke of WELLINGTON, was also sanctioned by the public feeling. But would either one or the other be obtained by the free and spontaneous subscriptions of the People? The popularity of the annual testimonial constitutes the great distinction. It is in that the O'CONNELL ANNUITY ob-

tains a pre-eminent value ; and however much it was the subject of sneer and sarcasm by his enemies, from Lord BROUGHAM down to the lowest Castle scribe, it will, by future generations, be considered a noble monument of the gratitude and justice of this country to her greatest Patriot. The expenses in collecting the Annuity were very considerable. The drawbacks and deductions were enormous ; and though on an average, from the commencement, there were fifteen thousand a-year collected, not more than two-thirds went to defray the expenditure in which Mr. O'CONNELL'S position inevitably involved him.

It may not be unacceptable to introduce in this place, SHEIL'S testimony in favor of the annuity ; though written in 1837, in the form of a letter to the Trustees of the Fund, enclosing his subscription. He places the annuity on its true and legitimate footing. He says :—

“ When I look back to the period at which I first took a part in the struggle for our enfranchisement, I own that, although many years have gone by, the feelings with which I then surveyed the debasement of my country, mingle even now with the recollection of her wrongs—and I experience at this distance of time, a renewal of the emotions with which, from my boyhood, I witnessed the indignities that were heaped upon us.

“ It is well to remember what we were ; but it is better to consider what we have become.

“ The transition is astonishing. I pass by details : I avoid a minute enumeration of the various incidents of the great change which we have witnessed, and which is not yet complete. I might point to the bar, to the bench, to the council chamber. I might advert to the striking circumstance, that a session, which will be memorable in the annals of the British empire, has been opened

with the speech of the hereditary head of the Roman Catholic aristocracy of Ireland. But I omit everything else, in order to direct the attention of my countrymen to a single fact. In the House of Commons—in that assembly, on which the fortunes of Cabinets and the fate of England depend—we not only participate in the functions of legislation with the best and proudest of the land, but we have taken that high position, which becomes the men by whom the cause of millions is asserted, and who are conscious, not only of the power of that mighty mass which they represent, but of the authority which is delegated to them.

“Do you remember the meetings in a small room in Capel-street, in which we scarcely dared to supplicate for justice? Do you read the debates in the Commons House of Parliament, in which Englishmen are told that justice must be done to Ireland, or that by the results of its denial they must be prepared to abide?

“But how has all this come to pass? Through whose instrumentality has this amazing revolution, moral, social, and political, taken place?

“There appeared amongst us a man, who to surpassing eloquence, united prodigious energy and indefatigable perseverance: his mind and his temperament were peculiarly adapted to the great task of liberating his country: he possessed, in the most eminent degree, the faculty of inflaming multitudes with the ardent passion by which he was himself kindled and inspired; but while he excited he controlled—he gave a wise and systematic direction to the power which had been created by him—the force which he succeeded in levying in countless masses, was not more impetuous than it was disciplined. He had the sagacity to discover, and the skill to apply, the great art of pacific agitation; and he has accomplished more by the victories

of peace, than others have achieved by the triumphs of sanguinary warfare.

“ We cannot estimate in money, what renown itself is scarce competent to recompense ; but it is no more than common justice that for pecuniary sacrifices an equivalent should be given.

“ He has abandoned his profession : others, to whom but for him the road to official distinction in that profession would have been for ever closed, have been raised to its highest dignities. Independently of his relinquishment of the advantages which were offered by his pre-eminence at the bar, he has incurred, and must continue to incur, a parliamentary expenditure as enormous as his position is unprecedented.

“ I, for one, feel convinced that in upholding the man who has not only effected the liberation of his country, but is still engaged in the performance of signal national services, Ireland will consult her best interest, as well as perform an obvious duty. As there is nothing which our enemies desire more strenuously than his ruin, there is nothing for which we ought to feel more solicitous than his sustainment : a great principle is involved in it ; and we shall give evidence in its assertion, that we are actuated by the unalterable determination to vindicate the rights of which he is the indomitable champion.”

We have deemed it necessary, at the outset, to advert to the objections urged on this subject. We may have occasion, as we proceed, to allude to them again.

The year 1831, glorious as it will be in the annals of England, for the great and successful struggle then made for Parliamentary Reform, was also a stirring period in O'CONNELL'S life ; first, for his collision with Lord ANGLESEY, and his law officers ; next, for his active exertions in Parliament ; where his bland manners, his ready

eloquence and wit, and his playful humour, won the applause of all parties; and, lastly, for his great efforts out of Parliament, to rally the people of Ireland for Parliamentary Reform.

O'CONNELL had now arrived at such a position, as the organ and representative of the popular will, that he, in truth, possessed more real power than even the Government itself, with all the resources of the empire under its control. It will be seen, in this year, how effectively he used that power to check secret combinations and agrarian outrage; and though Lord ANGLESEY came over to Ireland, backed by EDWARD GEOFFREY STANLEY, of subsequent notoriety, with the evident intention of putting down O'CONNELL, it will be found how signal was his failure. O'CONNELL had then the whole mind of the nation under his control; and according as his policy dictated, were the people willing to obey.

The enthusiasm for Repeal, lighted up by letters from Darrynane, which exhibited itself so strongly in 1830, showed palpable symptoms of further extension at the commencement of the following year. The "Independent Club" of Drogheda, deserves special mention here, for the splendid demonstration it originated in that town, in favor of O'CONNELL and REPEAL, at the close of the last, and the Literary Teachers of Dublin, for their remarkable meeting on the first day of the New Year.—The manifestation of feeling at Drogheda was intense.—Nothing could exceed the reception O'CONNELL experienced from the people, or their ardour for the CAUSE.—It was then the practice to wear orange and green as the united emblem of national feeling. "Ireland for the Irish" was the universal aspiration. As it was an admitted truism, that union was necessary to obtain what all parties were so anxious for, the Orange of the North and

the Green of the South—became nationally intertwined. At Drogheda, placed as it were midway between both party divisions, these emblems of union were displayed, on this occasion, in abundance. The year 1830, closed with bright prospects for the national cause; and, as we have said, the new one was ushered in by a meeting of the literary teachers of Dublin, at which a petition for the Repeal of the Union was adopted. The proceedings were marked by the display of great talent and historical research. Mr. O'CONNELL attended “as one of the teachers of Ireland.” “I will,” he said “speak as a literary teacher; for though my lessons have been given upon politics, still it should be recollected, that a proper knowledge of politics, is an endeavour to secure the happiness of mankind; to give patriotism all the allurements which wisdom and intelligence can afford it; and to illustrate by science and classical knowledge, all the animating beauties which would excite in man the pure flame, and the sacred fire of love of country.” His speech on this occasion, was telling and effective—it was delivered in that flowing, lucid, easy, and unpremeditated style, for which he was distinguished. His clear musical voice, adapting itself to the stirring topics he touched, added marvellously to the effect produced by this speech. Whatever was the occasion, he never allowed the political events of the day to pass without comment; nor did he permit the meeting of the Literary Teachers to break up, before he had taken to pieces, with the skill of the master, a letter to the Irish magistrates, from Chief Secretary STANLEY, published a day or two previously. This subject requires especial elucidation. At this period several districts in Ireland were considerably disturbed; or, rather on the verge of disturbance, particularly the County of

Kilkenny. The great ever-galling cause was the 'Tithe system. At that time, and for some years after, the Protestant Rectors came into direct contact with the people, in the collection of their revenues. The Tithe Proctor was, in Ireland, the most abhorred of the human race; and many of the deplorable crimes that blacken the pages of Irish history, may be traced to the Proctor's acts. He was the veriest tyrant of the poor occupiers. The competition for land, amongst a purely agricultural population was so great, that rent to the landlord was paid, or rather promised, without reference to the other charges which followed land; and the tithes were invariably a surplus imposition. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back; so with, the Irish peasantry. Four of them were employed cultivating the same quantity of land that occupied one working farmer in England.—In the latter country, the cultivation of a like quantity yielded four times the produce which the Irishman drew from his allotment, though equal in acreage and superior in natural fertility. In England, the Landlord was satisfied with a third of the produce, as his rent. In Ireland, unfortunate competition gave the Landlord nearly the whole produce, deducting the insufficient support derived by the larger population; which, compared with produce, was located on the land. Unless, then, the cultivators of Irish soil were to starve themselves, in order to pay the Tithe-owner, there were no means remaining to satisfy his demand. The Rector claimed his revenue, with the same determination as the Landlord. He reasoned somewhat after this method. All property, he said, is but the creature of the law. Unless protected by the law, if a man relinquished his property for an hour, or if he dies, the first covens may take and keep it. Every man then holds, or inherits property by the same title as the

Tithe-owner—by law ; and so long as the Tithe-owner's income is provided for, as it is, by law, so long will he insist on payment. Thus did the Protestant Incumbents reason with the people, who resisted their demands, or came to them for reductions. The people, however, whose "hatred of Tithes was as lasting as their love of Justice," could not understand the argument. They felt oppressed by the burden. They knew, from tradition, that a great portion of the miseries their forefathers suffered, arose from the Tithe system. They knew that the domains and the extensive parks of the rich Protestant proprietors, were exempted from the impost; because, for the most part, they were pasture grounds, and that on their own industry was the burden placed. They were exasperated by the obligation of paying, when they received no value ; and while they cheerfully paid their own pastors, they writhed under the infliction of the Protestant Rector's claim. When taunted by some of the latter and told to go to their landlords for reductions in their rent, the people answered, that at all events they received some value from them, but none from the parson ; and that, if one quarter of it were disposed of, as in Catholic times, to maintain the poor, they would be reconciled and satisfied to go on paying, and without a murmur. This determined hostility to the exaction of Tithe was cause sufficient to demand its legal abolition. But so long as it was law, it was hard to expect the Clergyman to relinquish his private rights. The consequence was, particularly wherever the Tithe Composition Act was not brought into operation, that the most dreadful scenes were constantly enacted. The people had decreed the downfall of the system ; and down they were determined it should go, at whatever hazard. But experience ought to have taught them this lesson—that violence and outrage rather.

aggravate than remedy a legal evil. At the time of which we write, the tenantry in Kilkenny were especially conspicuous in their open hostility to the Tithe system. Their proceedings were not so undisguised or violent, as was the conduct of the peasantry of Munster, in the Tithe war of 1822. On the contrary, they proceeded to act with a degree of diplomatic caution. Their habit was, to meet under pretence of "goaling," each with a "hurly," as it is called, in his hand; and thus armed, afterwards to visit obnoxious parties, or seek interviews with the most exacting Clergymen, for the purpose of getting reductions of Tithe. In some cases they assembled to the number of thousands. A remarkable scene occurred at one of these "Hurlers" meetings. Mr. COSTELLOE, a Dublin Solicitor, we believe, and who seemed, from former acts of devotion to their cause, to have acquired their confidence, attended on the occasion. To give the meeting a legal character, he had a person formally appointed Chairman; and having then addressed them at length, on the topics of the day, he called on them, one and all, to fling their "hurleys" into a river running by. After some hesitation, one of the implements was thrown in, and thousands instantly followed; the surface of the stream was covered with the rejected weapons. Such is the deference, the respect, the obedience which the Irish peasant pays to those in whom he has confidence.

Mr. O'CONNELL was naturally alarmed at this state of things. He was aware of an intention, on the part of Government, if possible to connect those agrarian outrages with the Repeal agitation; and thus taint the legality of the latter. He knew, too, that without any such connexion, disturbance of any kind must injure it. He was engaged in a great experiment. He was

working out a new principle in politics, of which he was the Apostle. It was this:—that the greatest social and political changes—nay, revolutions, may be accomplished by peaceful and constitutional means—by the agency of mind—without the shedding of a drop of human blood—without recourse to physical or armed violence. In the midst of this glorious undertaking—of this great experiment, it was naturally embarrassing to him to see the misguided people of Kilkenny engaged in those assemblies. He accordingly issued one of the spirit-stirring and persuasive letters with which he was accustomed to address the people. Indeed, in point of eloquence, force, and clearness, and for its purpose of ultimate effect, the letter to the Kilkenny “Hurlers,” was equal to any he had ever written. He spoke to them of the Repeal of the Union. He told how it was to be struggled for. He showed them the distinction, in point of effect, between his peaceful and their violent system. He pointed out to them how their proceedings retarded the public cause: and then he called on them not to injure any man in his property, and to forego their meetings. They obeyed. While he thus counselled the people, he did not allow Mr. Secretary STANLEY to get off free. As already stated, the Chief Secretary had addressed a circular to the Irish Magistrates, calling on them, while they respected meetings, held peaceably for the purpose of petitioning, to discountenance and put down, as illegal, all meetings whose object, whatever may be the pretence, was to accomplish changes in the law by force and intimidation. The Magistrates were to be the judges of the object of those meetings; while Mr. STANLEY laid down the broad constitutional principle of “the right of petition,” he undoubtedly left it to their discretion to determine what meeting was to be put down.

and which allowed to continue. O'CONNELL, in his speech at the Literary Teachers' meeting, in which he ably took to pieces this official document, said, that it reminded him of the story of the bailiff, who attempted to arrest a young man in College, when the students surrounded, seized, and subjected him to the discipline of the pump. One of the Fellows passed by, and the bailiff, thinking he would be protected by him, called out to the Fellow to save him. "Yes, I will," said the Fellow; "Don't, boys, by any means nail his ear to the pump." "You can imagine," continued Mr. O'CONNELL, "what effect the advice had on the students. So, with STANLEY'S letter; it says to the country magistrate, " 'Don't take the right of petitioning from the people— "don't nail the poor man's ear to the pump. "

The whole of this speech is, indeed, full of those playful and ready illustrations, for which his addresses were peculiarly distinguished. For variety, for alternations, humorous or serious, pathetic or didactic, he had no equal; and though many who had never the happiness of hearing the great orator, can form no notion of his power over an audience, for it was like enchantment, still, they cannot fail to experience emotions of the deepest pleasure, and acquire adequate conceptions of the man, from the perusal of his speeches when published; particularly from those delivered in latter years, when the science of reporting had to meet the demands he himself made on it, and had reached the degree of perfection at which it has arrived.

The Repeal agitation was progressing rapidly. Acting on two maxims, enunciated by SAURIN, in the days when he too was a patriot—namely, "that agitation was the price paid for liberty," and that no country should remain a province, which had strength to be a

nation—O'CONNELL began to turn into effect the lessons which, during twenty years of Catholic agitation, he had taught the people. He did so for the purpose of arousing them to one general effort for nationality. The Government were alarmed at his progress. They sent the Marquess of ANGLESEY over, for the express purpose of putting down the agitation. He who, in his celebrated letter to Archbishop CURTIS, on leaving Ireland in 1828, had, with emphatic reiteration, advised the people to agitate—agitate—agitate—he it was who was sent to proclaim down the practice. He who at a previous period, talked of riding down the people with a troop of hussars, was again sent to control them with THREE GUN BRIGS. He who left Ireland amidst the regret of all, and at the height of popularity, because he preached the same doctrine that O'CONNELL taught, now came back to belie his own preaching, and to crush the Agitator. STANLEY was his assistant. We shall see how they succeeded—that is, how signally they failed.

It has been already said, that the “Breakfast Meetings” had proceeded and were successful, in spite of the Algerine Act. But this was in the Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND's time, and while Sir HENRY HARDINGE was Secretary. The Duke was a quiet *laissez faire* Tory, and HARDINGE a high-minded prudent soldier. Neither wished to press matters to extremities, and the Breakfast Meetings continued to be held. But they were, to avoid all danger, called during the STANLEY *regime*, avowedly for charitable purposes. In the first week in January, there was an extraordinary assemblage of this description at HOLMES's, for the benefit of the Dublin Orphan Asylum. There were over three hundred gentlemen and one hundred and fifty ladies present. O'CONNELL presided; and, as may be well imagined, his speech was

powerful in argument, in matter, and in style. It was at this meeting and in this speech, that he announced his intention, in consequence of Lord STANLEY'S unconstitutional letter, as he termed it, of framing an Association to protect the right of petition, and be styled "A General Association for Ireland, to prevent illegal meetings, and protect the exercise of the sacred right of Petitioning."

It was then the struggle between the Irish Government and O'CONNELL fairly commenced. The LIBERATOR had, in truth, responsibilities sufficiently onerous on his shoulders. The wholenation was depending on his simple exertions. On his knowledge of law, his friends and followers relied, to steer them safely through the storm they saw coming. These Associations were, it is true, composed of enthusiastic men, and crowds attended them. But he was a guiding star. He was himself the Association. He was all and every thing. Was an address to be composed, a letter written—resolutions drawn up—advice to be given—or the agitation developed—on him all the labour fell. His hours were incessantly occupied; and surrounded by anxious *aides de camp*, he bore the burden bravely. But he was a HERCULES in constitution, as well as in mind. According to his pledge, given at HOLMES'S, the new Association was formed, and its first meeting was held at the Parliamentary office, which he had established the previous year. He addressed the meeting at great length, and with his usual perspicuity. He was nearly two hours speaking. He went fully into the state of Irish affairs— inveighed against STANLEY'S unconstitutional letter—lacerated the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, and demonstrated the utter weakness of the absurd policy adopted by Lord ANGLESEY. He denounced, too, in his speech, as he did two days after in a letter to the tradesmen of Dublin, the secret Societies then in vogue

amongst the working classes. The greatest enthusiasm prevailed at the meeting ; and after Mr. O'CONNELL concluded his speech, several influential men volunteered to go to different Counties, to counsel and warn the people, and show them the folly and mischief of their acts. The very next day, this Association was proclaimed down, by the mere act of the Viceregal will. Again, there was a meeting at the Parliamentary Office ; and again O'CONNELL made a masterly speech, full of patriotic fire. He principally addressed the people—calling upon them, as he did in a letter published the day before, to give up their combinations, and lend him, by their peaceful demeanour, every assistance in working out the amelioration of their condition. In this effort, his influence was powerful, and was effective. The next question was, how was the agitation to be continued. Every form of association had been proclaimed. Even the breakfasts at HOLMES'S were put down. What was to be done ? O'CONNELL announced that he substituted himself for the proclaimed associations ; because the law could not reach him, as an individual, and he appointed Mr. DWYER, his Secretary. In reality, this was making no change ; for he was always the animating spirit of every association, or meeting, under whatever name assembled.

The Government did not stop here ; a fourth Proclamation was issued, prohibiting all kinds of Association, under any name whatever. Mr. O'CONNELL had, previously to the fourth Proclamation, invited his friends to meet him at dinner, at HAYES'S Tavern. Over three hundred attended ; and the proceedings, as may be supposed, in the existing excitement, were deeply interesting. The LIBERATOR was in the Chair, and spoke for over an hour and a-half.

On the following morning, the Committee of thirty-one selected to make preparations for the Repeal meeting, to be held in Dublin, assembled at the same tavern to breakfast. O'CONNELL, who again presided, was defending the legality of the proceedings, when Alderman DARLEY, and Mr. J. C. GRAVES, (two of the magistrates of the Head Police,) accompanied by Mr. FARRELL, (chief constable,) entered the room.

The following dialogue immediately took place.

“ Alderman DARLEY said, I hope I do not disturb you, Mr. O'CONNELL ?

“ Mr. O'CONNELL—Not at all, Alderman DARLEY, I was only explaining the Act of Parliament.

“ Mr. GRAVES—We do not come here to discuss it.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL—I was not addressing myself to you, Sir, but to Alderman DARLEY, who always conducts himself like a gentleman.

“ Alderman DARLEY—Mr. O'CONNELL, you must be aware that I came here in consequence of the Proclamation, and as a Magistrate, to direct that the present meeting shall disperse.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL—You must know, Alderman DARLEY, that there is a certain form prescribed in the Act of Parliament. We require, now, that that form shall be adhered to. We refuse to disperse under that Act, till the Act itself has been followed by the Magistrates.—If you do not choose to adhere to that form, and lay your hand upon any man here, he shall immediately leave the room ; but you must prepare for the consequences.

“ Alderman DARLEY—Very well, Mr. O'CONNELL, I shall read the form prescribed by the Act of Parliament. (The Alderman here pulled out a piece of paper, which he was about reading.)

“ Mr. O'CONNELL—Alderman DARLEY, before you read that paper, requiring the present meeting to disperse, I beg to tell you, and I think it my duty to apprise you, that this meeting is not connected, nor does any one in it belong to any association, assembly, or society; nor is it connected with any body whatever, mentioned in the proclamation.—These things I feel it necessary to inform you, and you will now proceed at your peril. I say this with every personal respect for you, who I know are performing that which you consider your duty, as being ordered to perform it by the present administration. I feel it to be my duty to tell you this. I do this as a free born British subject, availing myself of all the privileges of a freeman, having every respect for the law; but at the same time determined to avail myself, and take every advantage of it. Again then I tell you, Alderman DARLEY, and caution you, that the present assembly does not belong to, nor is it connected with, any society mentioned in the proclamation.

“ Ald. DARLEY—I shall now read for you the form required by the act, and do that which I am directed under the proclamation. (The Alderman here read the prescribed form.)

“ Mr. O'CONNELL pulled out his watch, and said, it is now ten minutes after eleven.

“ Mr. GRAVES—By my watch it is eight minutes.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL here addressed the meeting, and said—Gentlemen, this proceeding is totally illegal; but the gentlemen, who are come here, and who have dispersed this meeting, are acting as Stipendiary Magistrates, under the orders of their superiors. The proceeding is at variance with British liberty; but it has the appearance of the law; and I now call upon you to obey even that which has the appearance of law; and I trust,

that a reformed Parliament will yet punish those who have thus caused the dispersion of a meeting, assembled to do that which is most constitutional, and best becomes British subjects to perform—forwarding petitions to parliament. (Cheers.) Now, gentlemen, we will all disperse.

“ The meeting then dispersed, giving three cheers for a repeal of the Union.

On quitting HAYES's, Mr. O'CONNELL proceeded, accompanied by many persons, to the Chamber of Commerce, where he remained a short time. While there, he repeatedly intimated his intention of following up his declaration of advising a call upon the Banks for gold, and also advising the non-consumption of exciseable articles.

His declaration respecting the banks was contained in the following letter :—

“ TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

“ Merrion-square, Jan. 14, 1831.

“ FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—One word more on the fourth Proclamation; one word of caution. The object of these proclamations is to gag the Irish People. We are not deemed worthy of liberty of speech; and you will find, I am told, sage political hypocrites, and still more base and time-serving Catholics, to applaud the Algerine measures, which would silence the voice of Ireland.

“ It is said that one of the principal managers of the Provincial Bank in this country has, in conjunction with a slavish Catholic of the Bank of Ireland, stipulated to support the despotic proclamations; and to applaud to the very echo, the despotic acts of unlimited power.

“ Perhaps I am unnecessarily alarmed; but I can scarcely believe that the underlings of Government would put these money-dealers into motion, unless there was a de-

termination to assail the last refuge of freedom in Ireland—the liberty of the Press.

“ It must be some very important measure of this description, that would bring forth the powerful engines of our two paper banks. The soldiery and the police may answer to crush other political nuisances, but when the liberty of the Press is assailed, it is necessary to bring forth the great monied interests; the men whose opinions would be likely to influence special juries. There is an appearance of this description in the Chamber of Commerce, and any man who possesses sagacity, may safely conjecture the motives of the movement.

“ There is also a phrase in the last proclamation; I mean the fourth, because I do not know whether or not it be the last, which seems to countenance the suspicion, that when despotic power may have silenced the human voice, it will proceed to silence the press, that is, to attempt to silence the press.

“ Mark me well, my countrymen, I some time ago advised everybody to exchange his notes for gold. I am convinced that it is essentially necessary for the permanent good of Ireland, that the present anomalous state of the currency should be corrected, and that England should not have the advantage over Ireland of a gold circulation, whilst Ireland had only paper.

“ There is turbulence and disaffection in England, to an extent that may produce an insurrectionary movement in that country. In that case, bank paper would become worthless; England would have the advantage of possessing gold, whilst the hands of the Irish would be left quite empty.

“ I have, however, heretofore done my duty. I have last year suggested to the People of Ireland to call for gold, It is quite true that I did not follow up that suggestion

by repeating my advice. The truth is, I have been deterred by a fear of lessening the resources of private individuals in trade; and I cannot, without an overpowering motive, consent to risk any private or individual inconvenience, even for the greatest public advantage.

“ Let the People of Ireland, therefore, pause for the present. Let them watch the motives of the vile underlings of despotic authority. Let them wait patiently till they can see whether the Press is to be assailed. Until then, I am neutral.

“ But if the press be assailed—if the persecution extends to the last hope of freedom, the press—that instant I will use all the energies of my mind; and whatever influence I possess, to lessen the power of the paper makers, and produce a general gold currency.

“ I do hope that if my fears are realised, and the press shall be assailed, there will not be, one week after, a single bank note in circulation.

“ I cannot conclude even this letter without cautioning the People against secret societies—against illegal oaths, and against every species of tumult, violence, or outrage. The Repeal of the Union cannot be long delayed by their enemies, but it may be fatally retarded by the misconduct of the people themselves.

“ I am, fellow-countrymen, your devoted servant,

“ DANIEL O’CONNELL.”

It is impossible to describe the excitement which all these proceedings created. At the Theatre, where he had the hardihood to appear, Lord ANGLESEY was hooted, and otherwise insulted, in the most marked manner. Affairs wore a threatening aspect. O’CONNELL again addressed the People of Ireland, calling on them to obey the law, and be peaceable. From the comments of the Press on these transactions, it is evident the feeling prevailed that the struggle was one directly between despotism on the

one hand, and liberty on the other ; according to the tendency of their opinions, classes were divided. Many, who did not approve of Mr. O'CONNELL's attack through the Banks on the commercial interests, took his side, because of the oppressive acts of Government. Many, on the other hand, sided with Lord ANGLESEY, because they dreaded the Repeal agitation, and could not believe that Proclamations were materials more suitable to feed than to suppress the flame which was now burning over the whole country. The policy of issuing proclamations was, from the beginning to the end, a decided blunder on the part of the Irish Government. Still, encouraged by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, the Whigs continued their unconstitutional proceedings, notwithstanding the strong expression of opinion at public meetings in Dublin, and throughout Ireland. Mr. STEELE was arrested for a seditious speech at one of the breakfasts ; Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DWYER and Mr. LAWLESS, were also arrested ; and, last of all, DANIEL O'CONNELL. He was arrested in his house by a Peace Officer and Chief Constable, at ten o'clock on the morning of the 19th of January. He was arrested for *evading* the Lord Lieutenant's Proclamation. As he walked from his house to the Head Police Office, in company with the Peace Officer, the people at once suspected, seeing him in such company, that he was under arrest. Instantly a dense mass of persons assembled. During his stay in the Police Office, the doors had to be barricaded, and when O'CONNELL attempted to make his way home, he found it impossible to succeed, until he had addressed the crowd from the drawing room windows of Mr. FITZ-PATRICK's residence in Dame-street. They were then satisfied, and he succeeded in getting back to Merrion-Square.

The following account of what occurred in the Police

Office, is abridged from the *Dublin Morning Register*. The particulars will be found to possess much interest :—

It was within a few minutes of eleven o'clock, when Mr. O'CONNELL, accompanied by Captain MORGAN O'CONNELL, and followed by Mr. FARRELL, entered the Board-room.

Mr. FARRELL said—Here, your Worships, is Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. O'CONNELL walked quickly up to the table, and then said—I wish to know whether you yourselves, or by the directions of those of higher authority, have thought fit to have me dragged, like a felon, through the streets—one who is a householder of the city of Dublin, and a member of the Imperial Parliament—and that you have sent your common thief-catchers to my house, without giving me the slightest notice? I wish in the first instance, that this question should be answered.

Alderman DARLEY—We have acted under the directions of those of higher authority.

Mr. O'CONNELL—I am glad of it—they may degrade themselves, but they cannot degrade me. I now wish to know if you have informations upon oath?

Alderman DARLEY—We have.

Mr. O'CONNELL—I wish to have them read. I demand that they shall be read.

The Magistrates here looked at one another for a few minutes.

Mr. O'CONNELL—I demand to have any information upon oath that you have read to me. Mr. O'CONNELL here put on his hat, and said, I mean no disrespect to you, but I am a member of the House of Commons—I am the equal of the Marquess of ANGLESEY, and I am determined to maintain inviolate the high privileges of which I am possessed.

Mr. GRAVES—We mean no disrespect to you, Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. O'CONNELL—Then, gentlemen, I have no objection to remove my hat ; but I do it out of compliment to you.

Major SIRR—Will you take a chair, Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. O'CONNELL—No, thank you, I had rather stand.

The Magistrates here conferred together for a few minutes, and at length Mr. GRAVES said—do you require the names of the informants ?

Mr. O'CONNELL—I do.

Mr. GRAVES—It is not usual to give them ; but I see no objection to it, Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. ROSS COX, Clerk in the Head Office, here read the informations, which stated that they were made by ROBERT FRANKLIN, and GEORGE BELGRAVE SNELL, gentlemen, of Grafton-street, in the city of Dublin ; who, being sworn before Alderman DARLEY and Major SIRR, deposed, that they attended a meeting at the Parliamentary Office, in Stephen-street, on the 10th day of January, and that the chair at said meeting was taken by JOHN REDMOND, and that speeches of considerable length were made on various subjects—the Repeal of the Union, the proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, the suppression of a society, directed by that proclamation ; that DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., was the first person to address that meeting ; that he severely animadverted upon said proclamation ; that said act was an act of despotism against his unfortunate country ; that it was *black in the annals of despotism ; that every honest man, in the sight of God, should look for retribution !* (The reading of this passage excited loud laughter in the office.) That Mr. O'CONNELL further said, that this was a most unjust and despotic Act of Parliament ; that Lord ANGLESEY's procla-

mation had dissolved the society, but he could not disperse him (Mr. O'CONNELL); and he (Mr. O'C.) further said, that he meant to conclude by a vote that the Association should stand absolutely dissolved, and that he should stand in the place of that Association; and that said passage in his speech was received with loud cheers.— That Mr. O'CONNELL then continued by saying, that the course which he would advise would be, that any attempt to abridge liberty made it necessary for them to have still more agitation, and that for one Association that was put down, they should constitute others. That there was a proclamation issued, and that he should propose three different modes of continuing agitation; that Mr. O'CONNELL then proposed, as a first resolution, that the intended society for preventing illegal meetings should stand dissolved; and then that having got rid of that he should stand in the situation of it; that he would appoint Mr. DWYER as his Secretary; that he would tell the people to submit to the law, and even to the semblance of the law; that if a Magistrate came to any meeting to disperse them, that they should take care to tell him, that if he sent in a single policeman, or an unarmed child, to lay his hand on each man, he should then go off——

Mr. GRAVES (to whom Major SIRR had been speaking for some time) here stopped Mr. Cox in reading the informations, and said—Mr. O'CONNELL, this is a very long information; it goes through the whole of the several meetings you attended, and it closes, as the warrant does, charging you with a conspiracy to defeat and evade that proclamation, and marking the continuation of those meetings from one to the other, as you must have seen from the perusal of the copy of the warrant; I think, then, that it would be very inconvenient to have the whole of it read.

Here a discussion arose between Mr. O'CONNELL and the Magistrates ; the one insisting on having the whole of the informations read—the others refusing, without giving any reason except that they were acting on authority. While Mr. O'CONNELL was proceeding to argue on the illegality of his arrest, the door of the Magistrates' private apartment was opened by a peace-officer, the door of which was a little ajar, and a gentleman was seen standing inside as if listening ; he instantly darted behind the door out of sight.

Mr. O'CONNELL.—There is Baron TUYLL in the other room—I see the Lord Lieutenant's Private Secretary looking in at us. You (to the Magistrates) are, indeed, I find, acting under superior authority. Mind, Baron TUYLL is in the other room, (to the Reporters) take a note of that. Let me repeat, that as the KING has not such an authority over meetings of his subjects, the Lord Lieutenant cannot have it.

The door of the private apartment was again opened a little.

Mr. O'CONNELL.—Baron TUYLL may as well, I think, come into the room at once.

Mr. O'CONNELL then proceeded with great calmness and decision to argue at great length on the rights of the subject, under the law, which no Proclamation of a Lord Lieutenant could take away, and concluded thus :—

“ As a lawyer, I now tell you that you are acting against the law. I also tell you that what is done here shall be investigated elsewhere. This will have to be before a Jury ; and their justice, and, I trust, their firmness will prove, that a British subject is not, with impunity, to be deprived of his liberty ; I have now to observe, that I have been detained here, at least, half an hour.

Alderman DARLEY—But for your address to us, we would not have detained you half so long.

Mr. O'CONNELL—You admit, then, that I am in your custody.

Alderman DARLEY—You certainly are; and we will require bail.

Mr. O'CONNELL—Mr. GRAVES is a lawyer—let him point out any one iota of the statute that has been violated.

Mr. GRAVES—The statute directs the meeting to disperse the moment the proclamation is read.

Mr. O'CONNELL—It happens, unluckily for you, that there is not the least allegation in the warrant of any violation of that clause. But the truth is, your case is not better founded in law than in fact.

Alderman DARLEY—We are acting under authority, and we require you to give bail.

(Here the head of Baron TUYLL appeared again.) Oh, said Mr. O'CONNELL, are we to be dictated to by German Barons—send him back with an account that you are determined to listen to no reasoning.

Alderman DARLEY—Baron TUYLL only came to me on private business.

Mr. O'CONNELL—Of course. But I demand my instant liberation.

Alderman DARLEY—We require you to give bail.

Mr. O'CONNELL then entered into the requisite securities, himself in £1,000, and two sureties in £500 each.—Mr. JEREMIAH M'CARTHY, of Dawson-street, and Mr. FITZPATRICK, of Dame-street, were his securities.

We shall now follow rapidly to its termination this proceeding—On the 24th January, the Term commenced, and the Grand Jury of the City of Dublin were sworn—Judge JEBB addressed the Jury at great length on the law bearing on Mr. O'CONNELL's and the other traversers' case. His opinion may be summed up in one sentence—

Under the Statute, known familiarly as the Algerine Act, the LORD LIEUTENANT had the power to proclaim any assemblage having, *in his judgment*, a tendency injurious to the public peace ; and any one afterwards disobeying that Proclamation, was declared guilty of a misdemeanour. The Grand Jury, without much deliberation, found the bills. In the interval, Mr. O'CONNELL published a letter to his constituents, in which he asserted that the object of the prosecution was, to prevent his attending in his place in Parliament, where he would press for the abolition of Tithes, and the Repeal of the Legislative Union. He also dwelt at length on the illegality of the prosecution against him. This letter was published in the *Freeman's Journal*. On its appearance, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL applied for an attachment against the Proprietor, for breach of privilege, and interference with the cause of Justice ; in attempting, by the publication of that letter, to prejudice the minds of those from whom were to be selected the Jury to try the Traversers. In the course of his address, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL took occasion to comment upon Mr. O'CONNELL's law. This appears to have been the object of the application ; for though a conditional order was granted, the proceedings were not followed up. Subsequent events, probably, were the cause of this abandonment. There were thirty-one counts in the Indictment. The first fourteen counts charged the Traversers with having violated the provisions of the Algerine Act ; and the remaining seventeen, charged them with fraud and duplicity against the Government of the Country ; in other words, that they evaded the Proclamations ; though the ATTORNEY-GENERAL positively denied there was any such charge in the indictment. O'CONNELL demurred to the first fourteen counts, and pleaded not guilty to the others. The effect of a plea of demurrer is, that, if the point of

law on which the demurrer is joined, is declared invalid by the Court, judgment of guilty is entered up against the Traverser without trial by Jury. There being no moral guilt attachable to the infringement of the Algerine Act, and O'CONNELL having a strong opinion, that in point of law he did not violate the statute; and having, moreover, we suspect, no hopes of a fair trial in those days, from a Dublin Jury, he preferred to take his chance on the legal argument. With respect to the other counts, which involved moral direliction, he pleaded, of necessity, not guilty. The demurrer rather disappointed the people. They did not like the idea that the position of O'CONNELL should depend on the validity of the point of law, to be decided by the King's Bench; and though they had not much reliance on a Dublin Jury, they preferred that the case should be tried on its merits. Influenced by these considerations, Mr. O'CONNELL applied by affidavit, to be allowed power to withdraw his plea of demurrer, and enter up NOT GUILTY. In this affidavit, he swore that he was not guilty of any of the counts. This sufficiently established his innocence, whatever course events might subsequently take. The withdrawal of the demurrer caused universal joy; and the excitement in Dublin was extreme. It was the intention, too, of large masses of people from the country, to come into town during the trial. This looked alarming; and both the Government and Mr. O'CONNELL were apprehensive of an outbreak. It was a posture of affairs that neither he or Lord ANGLESEY could desire. Popular tranquillity was the great adjunct of his agitation; and disturbance of any kind, would, doubtless, not be willingly encountered by the Irish Government. There was a general wish, on both sides, that the dangers attending a trial should not be tempted. Mr. BENNETT, who was formerly

O'CONNELL's friend, in PEEL's affair, wrote to him, proposing, as if from authority, to have the prosecution arranged. O'CONNELL positively refused to enter into any terms, and declined further correspondence. Mr. BENNETT, therefore, wrote to MAURICE, the LIBERATOR's eldest son. To this letter an answer was returned, in effect, that as Repeal was considered by O'CONNELL but a means and not an end, if the same measures of justice to Ireland were granted by the Imperial Parliament as would emanate from an domestic legislature, the Repeal question would not be pressed; and that O'CONNELL would use his influence with the people to give the experiment a trial. He was, when this correspondence transpired, charged by ENSOR and by HUNT, both of whom were ever hostile to him, with having entered into a personal compromise with the Government, in consideration of getting a seat on the Bench. This calumny was most satisfactorily refuted by Mr. BENNETT, and subsequently repudiated by O'CONNELL.

When the plea of NOT GUILTY was entered up, the ATTORNEY GENERAL applied to fix a day for trial. A day was fixed. In the meantime it was communicated to the ATTORNEY GENERAL that Mr. O'CONNELL intended to withdraw the plea of NOT GUILTY, provided a Writ of Error was allowed by the ATTORNEY GENERAL, to be tried before the Traversers were called up for judgment. This understanding was come to, and judgment was accordingly entered up against the Traversers. Mr. O'CONNELL solemnly averred, in his place in Parliament, that this course was adopted by him solely to avoid the disturbance he apprehended. He had established his innocence on oath. That was sufficient for his purpose. He knew perfectly well that he could never, after the understanding respecting the Writ of Error, be called up for judg-

ment. In this, his legal sagacity was superior to that of the ATTORNEY GENERAL. The Algerine Act was to expire on the 22d of April. By postponing the period of Trial, in the January Term, to the last day, sentence could not be passed until the next Term, and until the Writ of Error was argued. And when the Act expired, sentence could not be pronounced. Accordingly, when the April Term arrived, the ATTORNEY GENERAL announced to the King's Bench, that after having examined carefully all the Authorities on the subject, he found that after expiration of the Act, there was no power to inflict punishment under its provisions. Thus, the Government were out-generalled by O'CONNELL; and thus the drama closed. O'CONNELL, after he withdrew his plea of NOT GUILTY, on leaving Court announced to his anxious friends, that there was an end of the matter; and he immediately proceeded to take his seat in Parliament. It is from his explanation in the House of Commons, that a large portion of the foregoing account of the transaction is derived.

Having thus stated the leading points in this important part of the history of 1831, let us dwell on it for a few moments. We sincerely believe Lord ANGLESEY to have been well intentioned. His chivalrous character, and his former conduct in the Government of Ireland, justify that persuasion. We cannot, too, help thinking, that Lord CLONCURRY, who was and is so true a friend to Ireland, did not, merely because he was made an Earl, sustain Lord ANGLESEY against the popular feeling. His Lordship was too fond of popularity to have resisted it; did he not believe, from personal knowledge, that Lord ANGLESEY meant well. But the Whigs were far more hostile to the Repeal Agitation than the Tories; and Lord ANGLESEY came over with a fixed determina-

tion to grapple with O'CONNELL, and crush the Agitation. Lord CLONCURRY, though much of a Nationalist, was more of a Whig; and when called upon by O'CONNELL to head the Agitation for the cause he cherished, he declined, because he was unwilling to embarrass the Government. This conduct produced a very strong sensation in the public mind, and called forth the celebrated Letters addressed to his Lordship by O'CONNELL, which were at that time read with such absorbing interest. To attempt to put down the Agitation by this means was futile. And even if it could be successful, a Government that was employing Agitation, as the means to carry their Reform Bill, ought not to have recourse to prosecutions in Ireland; and surely Lord ANGLESEY ought not to have been their instrument.— Lord MILTOWN, afterwards Earl FITZWILLIAM, was a leading man amongst them. Did he not proclaim openly that he would pay no Taxes until the Reform Bill was granted? What carried the favourite measure of the Whigs—Civil and Religious liberty to Catholics—but Agitation? Was any great measure achieved without it? How was Slavery abolished? How was Free Trade, made triumphant? Can any proposition be more true than that “Agitation is the price paid for Liberty?” Yet, the Whigs, recreant to all their principles, in their hatred to Repeal, and guided, too, by the evil influence of STANLEY, waged this vindictive and useless war against Civil Liberty! No wonder O'CONNELL had, at that time, so strong a feeling against them; and whenever he drew a contrast, always gave a preference to the previous Government of the Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND, which announced that it would seek for no Coercive Act from Parliament. No wonder there arose such excitement in Ireland; and that both in Dublin and in the

Provinces so many Meetings of the People were held, and such strong Resolutions adopted. No wonder, in this state of things, that O'CONNELL should endeavour to conciliate Orangemen and Tories, and produce an union amongst Irishmen, which no Government could resist. No wonder, too, that he should have felt so confident of defeating ANGLESEY in law, when we find a Committee appointed to make arrangements for a public meeting, and which had no connexion whatever with any Association, dispersed by the Magistrates, without being proclaimed according to the provisions of the statute. But while we thus freely express our views on Lord ANGLESEY'S conduct, we cannot, on two points, admit that O'CONNELL was justified in the course he took. We do not think he ought to have called on the people to run for gold. The consequence might have been most disastrous to the country. The mercantile interests of the community should not, without an overwhelming necessity, be interfered with by political agitation. In this case, the conduct of Mr. LATOUCHE, of the Provincial Bank, was no justification; and if that establishment had not been most stable, the consequences might have been disastrous. There were subsequent periods when, if ever, such a course might have been justified, and it was not resorted to.— If in 1831, that course was politic; in later periods it was far more so. Again, it was scarcely right to have admitted, even on the principle of expediency, that Repeal was but a means to an end, and that if an Imperial Parliament could produce the end, a Local Legislature was not necessary; when it was well known O'CONNELL always maintained that the end; that is, the prosperity of Ireland, could never be obtained without the instrumentality of the latter. With the exception of these two objections, which, because it seems to us necessary, we put

Forward, nothing could be more gratifying than the noble demeanour of O'CONNELL, during this struggle with Lord ANGLESEY. He fairly discomfited the Viceroy. We cannot close this branch of the subject, without referring to a most interesting incident connected with it. It was an address presented to O'CONNELL, by the youth of Ireland, together with a scarf woven in Dublin, and composed of the two party colours, orange and green, blended together. The proceeding was thus described in the papers of the day:—

“ A public meeting of the Youth of Dublin, to petition for a Repeal of the Union, and to present an address to Mr. O'CONNELL, was held on Saturday, 29th January.— At about eleven o'clock, the juvenile patriots assembled in great numbers in Peter Street, decorated with orange and green scarfs and rosettes, and several bearing banners and streamers, all mottoed “ O'CONNELL, the LIBERATOR,” “ Repeal of the Union,” &c., &c. At a few minutes past 12 o'clock, they formed into procession and paraded through the streets, down to the Hibernian Arena, where an immense multitude received them with repeated cheers. The large gallery, which was appropriated to the use of ladies, was already filled with the female relatives and friends of the young gentlemen; there could not be less than six hundred respectably dressed females present; and the centre of the building was densely crowded by male spectators, while the youths themselves, to the amount of two thousand, occupied the other gallery and the platform. Altogether, there must have been six or eight thousand individuals present; for every possible resting place was occupied, and the utmost danger was risked by some to obtain a hearing and sight of the proceedings; besides, there were thousands in the streets clamorous for admittance, and so anxious to enter, that it was with difficulty they were pre-

vented from using violence, to the persons appointed by the committee to receive the admission charge at the doors, by Mr. STEELE, who was fortunately present on the occasion. About one o'clock, and until the termination of the business, the platform was so crowded that the proceedings were frequently interrupted; and the Reporters in attendance were unable to take notes of the speeches. It was with the utmost difficulty that even partial quiet was preserved during the reply of Mr. O'CONNELL to the address.

“ Master M'CARTHY, the son of an Orangeman, acted as chairman; and a fine lad, named CONWAY, discharged the duties of secretary and speaker, with admirable propriety and cleverness. The principal speakers were the Messrs. SHAW, SELLORS, O'GRADY, KEOGH, BYRNE, DOYLE, and ARKINS; and they delivered their sentiments with an energy of diction and elegance of address, which repeatedly called forth the applause of the multitude assembled. Some of the boys who moved and seconded resolutions, were not more than eight or nine years of age, and the oldest did not exceed fifteen. Even as an exercise of oratory, their display of talent was astonishing; but several of them seized on the circumstances around them, as matter for their speeches, in a manner that showed their abilities and originality of thought, in a striking point of view; and proved their claim to independence of feeling and opinion. Previous to the putting of the fourth resolution from the chair, Mr. O'CONNELL entered the Arena, and was received by some of the young gentlemen, who conducted him through the meeting to the platform, which he ascended amid deafening applause. It was with difficulty that the cheering was silenced after several minutes.

“ As soon as Mr. O'CONNELL had, amid the enthusiastic cheering of the assembly, taken his station upon the

platform, he was immediately surrounded by a deputation from the youths of Dublin, who came forward with an address to him. The address was then read by Master RATIGAN."

The reader can well imagine the beautiful reply of the LIBERATOR. On such occasions as these, so truly interesting in every point of view, he had a command over language which no man ever surpassed; and his tones, soft and musical and persuasive, touched the heart. His reply on this occasion, was as brilliant a piece of eloquence as he ever delivered. We feel confident that the young men who heard it, and to whom it was addressed, do not, and will never forget, to their latest day, the tone and language of their great Countryman, and the lessons which he taught them.

O'CONNELL, as previously stated, proceeded to Parliament immediately after the settlement of the prosecution. He took a very leading part, in every important discussion, particularly in reference to the Belgian Revolution. He was the MONTALEMBERT of the English Parliament; and as a sincere and zealous believer of Catholic doctrines, he was ever ready, like the French Peer, to defend the Ministers of his religion, whether those attacked were his own countrymen, or foreigners. The ungenerous and unfounded attack on the Belgian Priesthood had aroused his feelings, and he nobly vindicated them. But his noblest effort in Parliament, if we except some of his speeches on the Coercion Bill, was unquestionably his speech on the English Reform measure. It was admitted by all parties to have been decidedly the cleverest and most argumentative delivered during the debates. The writer of this was present on the occasion, and he perfectly well recollects the effect it produced. Mr. O'CONNELL came up to the table—opened up a large budget of papers—called upon the Clerk to read a passage from the stand-

ing orders of the House—gave his wig a twitch, and then calmly and distinctly proceeded for three hours to occupy the attention of the house, with a most masterly exposition of the abuses of the Borough-mongering system. The English Reform Bill received a second reading by a majority of ONE. The Ministry were afterwards, by a majority of FORTY-SIX, beaten on the timber duties. A dissolution then seemed inevitable. The Irish Reform measure was brought in. We shall take occasion, at another time, to offer some observations on that miserable enactment. The English Reform Bill went into committee, and there General GASCOYNE moved his celebrated amendment—namely, that the number of representatives for the Boroughs of England and Wales should not be diminished. His amendment, after a protracted debate, was carried by a majority of TWENTY-TWO. This brought things to a crisis. The KING, the next day, came down suddenly to the House, and prorogued the last borough-mongering parliament; and on the twenty-second of April, a dissolution was proclaimed. Then came the tug of war at the general election; the most desperate and expensive contest of the kind on record.

O'CONNELL was now so committed to the question, and he felt it so necessary to keep the Reformers together, in order to secure victory in coming struggles, that he refrained from pressing the Repeal agitation during this important contest; though he was afterwards charged, by ENSON and others, with having in consequence deserted the Repeal cause, the accusation was not just. O'CONNELL, at this crisis, acted, in the course he took, with his usual prudence, good sense, and foresight.

The first indication of this policy, on the part of O'CONNELL, was manifested in his address to the Elec-

tors of the Queen's County, in favor of Sir HENRY PARNELL. It was altogether a Reform address. Repeal was not even alluded to. Again, in his letter to "the People of Ireland," after the dissolution, Repeal was not mentioned. It was all "Reform"—"the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." In his own address to the Electors of Kerry, he, to use his own words, "rested his present claims *exclusively* on two points; "First—his opposition to the continuance of Negro Slavery; secondly, his decided advocacy of the Ministerial Bill for Parliamentary Reform." Again, he addressed Drogheda, for WALLACE, and against NORTH; and the theme was the Reform Bill. He employed every engine to secure, as far as Ireland was concerned, a majority for the ministerial measures; and he entered warmly into the new policy of giving a reformed Parliament a trial, and making one more experiment on the justice of England. It was a prudent, though, as it proved, a hopeless experiment.

All now was a scene of excitement throughout the United Kingdom. The English elections turned out largely in favor of the Bill. In Ireland, matters were advancing favorably.

The people universally followed O'CONNELL's advice, and the struggle here, as in England, was for "the Bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the Bill."

The Kerry Election terminated without opposition; the LIBERATOR was returned without a contest. Not so the Clare election, where his son MAURICE and O'GORMAN MAHON were rival candidates. This was an exceedingly unpleasant affair. These, however, are not the pages in which to enter into the altercations, the statements, and counterstatements—the duels—the abuse—the vituperative charges, and the intemperance exhibited before, during, and after the Clare election. Enough to say,

MAURICE O'CONNELL and Major M'NAMARA were triumphantly returned; O'GORMAN MAHON, notwithstanding his great acceptance with the people, lost the County. We leave the private squabbles to some other pen. This election, however, produced much mischief amongst the people of Clare. Besides, the County was fearfully disturbed, and a Special Commission was the consequence. The Terry Alts of Clare were the offspring of the system of pasturage so universal amongst the Landlords of that County; the spirit of disturbance was developed during the angry scenes of that memorable election. But, independently of the election, bad blood was excited there; and the dreadful outrages which then disgraced that County, would, in any case, have sooner or later taken place. O'CONNELL went down to the Commission to defend the people, and was enthusiastically received.

The Elections being now over, the LIBERATOR addressed the people on the meagre measure of Reform intended for Ireland. While the contests were going on, he very wisely remained silent; nay more, he actually, in his address to the Drogheda electors, praised the principle of the bill. But all danger being over, and a large majority secured for Reform, he pointed out distinctly the restricted character of the intended franchise, and the many defects of the Irish Bill. Nothing could be clearer than his exposition of the matter. He showed the injustice done to Ireland as compared with the concessions meted out to Britain. The franchises were actually and relatively higher in Ireland. A ten pound franchise in Ireland was equal to a twenty pound in England. The consequence was, that the Electors, in the ratio of the population, would be by far fewer in this country than in England; whilst the relative proportion of the representation was

equally unjust. This was a topic he often subsequently urged on the Nation; but never with more perspicuity and point, than in his address, dated the 31st May, 1831.

Before the meeting of the new Parliament, there was a splendid dinner given in the King's Room, Mansion House, in celebration of the triumph of Reform. At this dinner, Lord CLONCURRY presided. O'CONNELL was there, and spoke to the principal toast of the night;—namely, “Reform, based on the rights of the People—“making revolutions impossible.” We do not discern amongst the list of diners, the names of many of the Repeal party.

After the assemblage of the new Parliament, though Mr. O'CONNELL took a most prominent part, there is no effort of his, with the exception of an able speech on the proceedings of the Kildare Society, in which he showed up his old friend, the itinerant preacher, the Scotch Captain GORDON, then member for Dundalk—with the exception of that speech, and another equally powerful, on the Reform Bill, his Parliamentary labours were confined principally to a struggle, which was not successful, to have the Irish Yeomanry disarmed. These corps, always unpopular, were now the subject of intense hatred in Ireland, in consequence of the dreadful massacre perpetrated by them at Newtownbarry. This was an unfortunate Tithe affray. Cattle were impounded by the Proctor. The people, while endeavouring to rescue them, came in contact with the Yeomanry, who were called out by a Magistrate named GRAHAM, and twenty-one persons were killed or wounded. The massacre caused terrific excitement throughout Ireland; and during the entire session, O'CONNELL made repeated efforts to get the hateful Yeomanry disarmed. But, instead of being disarmed, Lord ANGLESEY had actually given them new

arms, in exchange for their old and less effective muskets.

We extract from *Dolman's Magazine*, for July, 1847, the following notice of the Newtownbarry conflict, and of a similar affray arising from the same causes, and occurring in another County. The extract is taken from the article headed, "*Sketches of Irish Agitators*," in the Magazine we have named.—

"In the early part of 1831, a fatal rencounter took place between a party of Wexford yeomanry, commanded by Captain GRAHAM, and a number of the peasantry, at Newtownbarry, in which eighteen of the latter were shot dead on the spot, or subsequently died of the wounds they received. The news of this terrible calamity spread the utmost consternation among all classes of society; it was looked on as the commencement of more serious and disastrous evils; and those who foreboded still more sad results as likely to follow, were not disappointed. Captain GRAHAM and his party were tried at the Spring Assizes which followed, and acquitted, on the ground of "justifiable homicide." Before the year terminated, a similar conflict—almost under similar circumstances—took place in a neighbouring county, equally as calamitous in its consequences. And it is because Mr. COSTELLOE was called on, in reference to it, to act so prominent a part, that I introduce the subject at all. My sketch would be incomplete without a passing notice of these stirring incidents.

"About half-way between Kilkenny and Waterford, on the great Dublin-road—which connects the southeastern part of Ireland with the metropolis—is a small village, which, at the time I write of, was a police-station. It was a locality replete with very sad recollections; and in connexion with which, wild and melancholy traditions existed among the surrounding peasantry. Em-

bowered in the plantations and avenues of the country seats that surrounded it, its very loveliness and extreme natural beauty gave a vivid colouring to those impressions so carefully handed down by at least three preceding generations. This, and the surrounding country for many miles, was particularly distinguished for its determined opposition to the payment of tithes.

“ On an evening in the latter end of November, 1831, two men took their seats on the Dublin and Waterford coach, for the village of “ Harvey.” Michaelmas term was just concluded, and a number of writs against defaulters in that part of the country, had been sued out of the Court of Exchequer, and entrusted to the care of those individuals. It is needless to add that they were process-servers, engaged to serve his Majesty's writs.— They arrived in due time at their destination on the following morning, and, as had been previously arranged, produced their “ writ of assistance” to the commander of the police-force, by which he was directed to aid them in the discharge of their duty. The order was delivered about noon; and, as they had many miles to travel to effect their object, the force was immediately drawn out; three-and-twenty men, armed with muskets, ready for the most desperate service. The party—headed by Captain LEYNE, and accompanied by the process-servers—proceeded on their way; but, notwithstanding the secrecy and silence with which it was conducted, they found the whole country, as they went on, in a state of terrible commotion. Bonfires illuminated the surrounding hills; the blast of horns resounded far and near; and, as if by magic, thousands of peasantry were congregated on a small eminence in front of the little party, armed with scythes, spades, and pitch-forks. This place lay directly in the path by which they were compelled to go, in order to effect a service on a man named WALSH. A narrow lane led to the open

space where the people were assembled, and through this the devoted party had not proceeded many yards, when they were assailed on all sides, overpowered by numbers, and, in the space of a few minutes, eighteen of the police—including their officer, and one of the process servers—were lying dead, weltering in their blood! The rest fortunately escaped, after receiving many severe wounds. This occurred about two miles to the west of the village of Harvey, at a place called Carrickshock; which has, unhappily, since that period, obtained a celebrity throughout the civilized world.

“A coroner’s inquest was summoned, and continued to sit for several days. A verdict of “wilful murder, against some persons unknown,” was returned, and a large reward offered by the government for the apprehension of the murderers. Twenty-five persons were apprehended and sent to Kilkenny, to abide their trial at the following Spring Assizes. The sad event, as might be expected, created a deep sensation; and, as it was known the Government intended to act with the greatest vigour in the prosecution of the criminals, the friends of the accused were equally on the alert to secure for them a competent defence. Mr. COSTELLOE was accordingly chosen their professional adviser; and, as usual, directed all his energies to the completion of the task assigned him. As the period drew near, the interest became more intense, and the excitement even more dreadful; jurors left the country, lest they should be called on to serve; and the whole frame of social life appeared to have been rent asunder. The time at last came, and on the evening of the day on which the commission was to be opened, the judges arrived from Waterford, escorted by a strong military guard, and passed, with the usual ceremonies, through

the crowded streets of the city to their lodgings, without any circumstance occurring of more than the usual interest. The county-court was opened the next morning, a few minutes before ten o'clock, when a terrific rush and struggle took place, until every available space was crowded, and every avenue leading to it filled with a deeply excited and interested multitude. At ten precisely, the late Chief Justice BUSHE took his seat, amid the profoundest silence, with that calm dignity and placid benevolent countenance, which those who have seen him on such occasions, can never forget. The Attorney-General—now Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench in Ireland—followed shortly after, accompanied by a host of able and distinguished lawyers, whose services the crown retained on the occasion. Mr. COSTELLOE had early secured the services of Mr. O'CONNELL for his clients, and accordingly, that hon. and learned gentleman arrived from parliament the previous evening, to conduct the defence. The business of the commission had hardly commenced, when he made his appearance, accompanied by Mr. DOMINICK RONAYNE—since dead—and one or two junior barristers who went the Leinster circuit. After the grand jury were sworn, the Chief Justice delivered one of those charges—so beautifully and impressively eloquent—so characterised by that strict impartiality, which made one of the most distinguished poets of that country say, that he ought to have been invested with the collar of gold—that neither prosecutor nor accused could find aught to complain of. The jury retired, and, in the course of the day, “true bills” were found against all the persons accused of the murder at Carrickshock.

“A man named MICHAEL KENNEDY, a farmer's labourer, was first placed at the bar. The principal witness against him was one of the police, who escaped, on

that fearful day, the general and indiscriminate massacre, in which so many of his comrades lost their lives. He was a clever, intelligent man, and gave his evidence with that coolness and perfect self-reliance on the accuracy of his statement, which it was believed impossible to shake. He identified the prisoner at the bar as being one of the persons concerned in the murder; he swore positively that he saw him strike several blows, and described his dress and person on the occasion with so much minuteness, that no doubt whatever existed in the minds of any present but that his evidence was strictly accurate. He was cross-examined by Mr. O'CONNELL; but, able—and indeed extraordinary—as his powers were on such an occasion, he felt for a few minutes that his case was hopeless. The witness was as firm as adamant. Mr. COSTELLOE'S lucky genius, however, had not forsaken him. By one of those fortuitous circumstances, which none but Attornies can appreciate, he learned in Court—while the cross-examination was proceeding,—that the witness's father had been, in his early life, a notorious sheep-stealer.

“ This piece of intelligence was communicated, in writing, to Mr. O'CONNELL, who, with his usual professional dexterity—although impressed with the importance of the intelligence—did not at first, nor indeed for some considerable time, seem to take any notice of it. At last, when the cross-examination was apparently over, and the witness flushed with the victory he had obtained over so redoubted a champion as a man who was the terror of all in similar circumstances, the learned gentleman jocosely asked him “ if he was fond of mutton ? ” “ Yes,” was the laughing reply; “ he liked a good piece of mutton.” He was then asked if he ever knew any expert sheep-stealers; and he said he met with some in the discharge of his duty

as a policeman. He was further asked if he were acquainted with any previous to his going into the police; but he energetically denied it. The question was repeated two or three times—in a manner that led him to suppose the counsel himself felt indignant at being obliged to put it to so respectable a person—until he denied, in the most solemnly impressive manner, that he ever knew or was connected with any such person. Then it was that O'CONNELL pounced upon him. The court rung and echoed again with the thunders of his indignation. The silent, stricken audience looked on with amazement at the portentous change of voice and manner which had taken place in the advocate, as well as in the witness; and, amid the hush of the multitude, the deep breathings of the prisoner, and the silent, heart-felt expectations of all present, the man was obliged to confess his father had been the expert sheep-stealer he so solemnly denied, knowing, on his oath, but a few minutes before!

“ Mr. O'CONNELL then sat down, and the witness left the table. The trial proceeded, but all felt that no conviction would take place of any of the prisoners. The principal witness had broken down in a manner so totally unexpected as to baffle every effort of the crown to sustain his evidence; and the prisoner's defence was, therefore, one of little difficulty. It consisted of an *alibi*.—The man in whose service he was, proved that he sent him to a neighbour for a ladder at the time the massacre was said to have been perpetrated; the person to whom he was sent, next deposed that he came for, and got it; and the chain of evidence was completed by further testimony, that he remained at work during the evening. All parties were correct; but it was perfectly consistent with their statement that he went for the ladder, and got it; that, on his return, he joined in the onslaught on the

police, and, as soon as it was over—say in five or six minutes—returned to his master's house.

“ Some of the other prisoners were placed at the bar, in succession, but no convictions took place ; and the prosecutions were ultimately abandoned.”

Mr. O'CONNELL's Reform speech, on Lord EBRINGTON's motion, was considered in England equal to the one he delivered in the previous Parliament. We cannot concur in that opinion. But of its great power there can be no question. The Lords had rejected the Reform Bill, notwithstanding the powerful appeal of Lord Chancellor BROUGHAM, who, after one of the greatest orations ever delivered within the walls of Parliament, on “bended knees” implored their Lordships to pass the measure. Lord EBRINGTON thereupon moved a resolution pledging the House of Commons to adhere to the Bill, in the teeth of the Lords' vote. MACAULEY and SHEIL had addressed the House in their best style, before O'CONNELL rose to speak ; but the impression he made was by no means weakened by the disadvantageous circumstance of coming after both those accomplished rhetoricians. It was in ready repartee he was particularly conspicuous. His famous reply to WETHERALL, who sneered at his “rollicking rhodomontade,” will be long remembered—for the apt application of SHAKSPEARE's words :—

“ The Prince of darkness is a gentleman,

“ *Whetherall* his name, and *Botherall*.”

So, likewise, his description of Sir R. VIVYAN, who was a kind of leader of the anti-reformers, and represented the country party. In the former Parliament, he was surrounded by the County Representatives of England. These now were gone ; Reformers were returned in their places ; and the poor Baronet stood almost alone,

Mr. O'CONNELL, in reply to one of his religious attacks, described him as—

“ The last rose of Summer left blooming alone,
“ All his lovely companions are faded and gone.”

O'CONNELL applied the same quotation, on a subsequent occasion, and with equally happy effect, to the late Mr. WALTER of the *Times*; when, amongst the unsteady adherents of the MELBOURNE Whigs, he was preparing to follow the flock of their supporters, who had taken wing, and left him and a few more almost “alone in their glory.”

Mr. O'CONNELL returned to Ireland with accumulated popularity, because of his great success in Parliament. He had completely triumphed over the prejudices, which, at first, encircled him, and had become one of the most influential Leaders of the House. There can be no question that there existed, on the part of the Ministry, a strong desire to secure his friendship. It was stated positively that he was offered the office of Master of the Rolls, and even that of Attorney General, and that he declined the one as well as the other. We are quite certain that, at a subsequent period, he refused the position of Chief Baron of the Irish Exchequer. In fact, he never would, for any office, in the gift of Government, give up the position he held in the affections of the Irish people. It was not in the power of any Government to purchase his services. He, however, returned to Ireland, with a patent of professional precedency. This he obtained through the intervention of the late lamented Lord Lieutenant, Lord BESSBOROUGH, then Lord DUNCANNON, who was always his steady friend. It was he, it will be remembered, who introduced him, in 1829, to the table of the House of Commons; and between both those distinguished men, there

was ever firm and uninterrupted friendship to the last. O'CONNELL was received with enthusiasm by the Trades, on his arrival in Dublin. They waited on him, in procession, to present him with an address. His reply was excellent ; but it disappointed the people, because of his avoidance of Repeal. It was said that though during the elections, Repeal was prudently kept in the back ground, now that these events were over, the favourite or national question should take the foremost position. Some portion of the Dublin press took this view of the subject ; and GEORGE ENSOR, who was an unyielding Repealer, addressed to the *Freeman's Journal*, one or two very strong letters on the policy pursued. LAWLESS, too, took the field in opposition to O'CONNELL.— But though he answered the attacks, he did not abandon the policy. He studiously avoided the Repeal discussion, except on one occasion, when SHARMAN CRAWFORD expounded his views of a Federal Legislature. Then, and then only, during the remainder of the year 1831, did O'CONNELL refer to REPEAL. He established a Society called the “ National Political Union,” in contradistinction to the Trades' political Union, with which he refused to have any connexion, except on terms demanded by him, and with which the Trades would not comply. From October, meetings of the former body were held twice a week ; and never in the previous history of his agitation, did O'CONNELL make more masterly speeches than during those sittings. They remind one of his later efforts, from 1840 to his death. The marvellous characteristic of these speeches is, their variety ; he managed to speak, for hours together, day after day, on almost the same topics ; and yet he could dress his ideas in a form ever attractive and new. Such was the wonderful fertility of his mind, and his power over language. Judging from the experience we have since had, there can be now no

question, that O'CONNELL ought not, after the elections, have given up the agitation for Repeal. But, to judge the matter fairly, it should be recollected that the country was then about to enter on a new state of things. A general idea seized possession of men's minds, that a reformed Parliament would do justice to Ireland. O'CONNELL may not himself have entertained sanguine hopes of great success; but, unquestionably, unless he gave the experiment a fair trial, he could never succeed in enlisting the thinking classes to any extent in the agitation. It was therefore at that time wise and prudent to try the effect of Parliamentary Reform; though, looking back on those days now, we should be inclined to regret he ever suspended the agitation for Repeal.

The year 1831 is remarkable for the passing of the National Education Act. Whatever merit is attached to the accomplishment of that measure, chiefly belongs to the present Lord STANLEY. It was the first real effort made to educate the Irish people, without subjecting them to the proselytizing ordeal of the Kildare Street Society. This system of giving instruction, without meddling with the religious belief of the pupils, has been attacked from two opposite quarters—by the evangelical Protestants, because the “ bible was excluded from the schools,”—and by some leading members of the Catholic Church, on the unanswerable ground, that instruction unaccompanied by religious teaching, is no education at all. However, after a time, seeing the difficulties which surrounded the question in Ireland, the Catholic Hierarchy and Clergy, influenced by the example of Archbishops CROLLY and MURRAY, became not only reconciled to the system, but even its strongest supporters. The hostility of the Protestant Clergy has also very much diminished. There can be no question, where children of every religious denomination

are brought together, it might be preferable, that they should be instructed in their respective creeds by their own Clergy, outside school hours. But where, as in the most part of Ireland, the children are without exception Roman Catholics, there, we think, for the sake of society, an exception to the rule should be made; and the great principles of their religion infused into their young minds, as they receive their ordinary instructions. It is in this respect, that the education received from the schools of the Christian Brethren, and of the Presentation Monasteries, exceeds that which is acquired at the National Schools. These holy men, even when teaching the exact sciences to the children, endeavour to mingle religious instruction with the knowledge they impart. By this method the pupils become imbued with high religious sentiments. This is the more necessary in Ireland, where there is not a sufficiency of Clergy, without such aids, to instruct both children and adults in the truths of religion. To cultivate and preserve religious sentiments in the minds of all the adult population, is more than they have the physical means of accomplishing. To the rule of excluding religious teachers from the National Schools, there are exceptions. In point of practice, we find that the rule is very much relaxed; and the Clergy have ample opportunities afforded them of seeing the children taught the doctrines of their faith. At present, the system is thriving admirably; and we may safely assert, that almost every child in Ireland is being educated. The books used are admirable in every respect; the masters employed, well trained to the profession; and the Inspectors, whose duty it is to visit the schools, most carefully selected after the most rigid examination. The reports published every year by the Board of Education are exceedingly interesting. On the whole, we consider the system thus introduced

by Lord STANLEY, into Ireland, one of the greatest benefits bestowed on her people, and therefore, as we have so much to condemn in his conduct, towards this country, we feel satisfaction in giving him applause where it is deserved.

In 1831, O'CONNELL had a quarrel with the Dublin Press. The origin, nature, and result of the quarrel, being very imperfectly known, we may take this occasion of giving a correct version of it, derived from an authentic source.

When the prosecution, under the Algerine Act, was instituted against him, it failed as we have seen. The indictment was founded on a reported speech and proceedings, of which, the Short-hand report was supplied by a Mr. ELRINGTON, for the prosecution; who then held the situation of a Reporter on *Saunders' News Letter*. ELRINGTON was a Limerick man; his name originally was NOLAN; he was a Schoolmaster, and a half-amateur, half-professional actor in his younger days. He became a Protestant; and, "thriving in the world," he changed his Milesian patronymic (NOLAN) for the more Anglican one of ELRINGTON; and eventually settled down as a Reporter on *Saunders'* newspaper; in which capacity he gave the Government of the day the benefit of his services, in reporting, and deposing to O'CONNELL's sentiments and proceedings.

It naturally enough excited O'CONNELL's indignation, that an Irish Reporter should be the agent of his prosecution; and he took several occasions to speak bitterly and sarcastically of the whole body. At one large meeting he used these words:—"Neither God nor nature ever intended those who are now on the Irish Press, to be competent to discharge such duties as they undertake;" and other language to that effect. This of course

excited the ire of the "Recording Angels" of that day. They took counsel on the matter, among themselves; held a meeting, at which Mr. WM. B. M'CADE, a leading member of their body, presided; and unanimously came to a resolution, not in future to report any speech which Mr. O'CONNELL might deliver at public meetings. This decision they published in the papers; and he, so far, was forewarned of their intentions. Well! the next meeting came round—the day on which the resolution was to be carried out; and the Reporters mustered strongly in their place at the Corn Exchange. When the proceedings commenced, they made themselves ostentatiously active in taking down the remarks of every previous speaker; but the moment O'CONNELL presented himself, they threw themselves back in their chairs, closed their note-books, flung down their pens, and folded their arms. Though fully aware of what was to take place, O'CONNELL'S exciteability got the better of his habitual coolness and tact; and he exclaimed, in accents of strong indignation—he happened, by mere accident, to stand exactly opposite the spot where ELRINGTON was seated, and looked him full in the face—"What! am I, who have fluttered the Minister in his Cabinet, to be nibbled at here by a parcel of mice?" Poor ELRINGTON, thinking to play the bravo with great effect, rose from his seat, and in a quasi-heroic tone said—"Sir, do you mean to call me a mouse?"

"No," said O'CONNELL, in his most keenly cutting style; "indeed, I don't; I couldn't be guilty of such a misnomer; sure all the world knows you're only a fine lump of a *rat*."

The roars of laughter that followed this scorching piece of wit, settled the question of the quarrel with the Press at that time. O'CONNELL turned the laugh so completely against his unfortunate victim, that the others

forgot the mighty pretty quarrel as it stood; their hostility was disarmed; they resumed their occupations; and O'CONNELL's triumph was at the time as complete as was poor ELLINGTON's discomfiture. A very humorous Epigram on the subject was circulated soon after, and helped to confirm O'CONNELL's triumph over his antagonists—a triumph which even his best friends often admonished him he remembered too long and too harshly. However, the following, written, it was said, by FURLONG, made many laugh at the time:—

“ THE PRESS ROW—SCENE, THE CORN EXCHANGE.

“ MR. O'CONNELL *loquitur*.

“ 'Tis I that can tell about Kerry,
And talk of the Lakes of Killarney;
'Tis I that can make the boys merry,
And bother the ladies with 'Blarney.'

“ Yet I, who have bearded Judge DOWNES,
And SAURIN put down in a thrice;
Oh, thunder and big blood and ouns,
Shall I be put down by the 'Mice?'

The year 1832 was, in the career of O'CONNELL, one of its brightest periods; as it was also one of intense interest to Ireland. In Irish history, it will be called the great Anti-Tithe year—in O'CONNELL's, it will be considered an era illustrative of his untiring energy and perseverance, both in Parliament and out. We have already glanced at the commencement of the Tithe agitation. We have seen how it originated with the “Hurlers” of Kilkenny, and we have marked the consequences of the ill-advised circular addressed by Mr. STANLEY to the Magistracy. Like all the acts of Government, suggesting coercion or violence, the letter failed in its object. The flame spread. The discontent assumed all the features of what, under Lord BROUGHAM's definition, would be,

and was, called "rebellion"—the "Tithe Rebellion" His Lordship's definition we take from a speech he delivered, in connexion with the Tithe agitation, in Parliament. His observations ran thus:—"As a lawyer, as well as a Member of that House, he did not hesitate to say, that rebellion as much consisted in such acts, or such a course of conduct, as by bringing together, in any part of the empire, great assemblages of people, and producing such excitement, as to place the laws in a state of abeyance; and, in a word, to annihilate their operation, accompanying such conduct by acts of outrage, conformable to the design of compassing those objects; that, he would say, was as much rebellion as any other act or any course of conduct."

O'CONNELL, and other constitutional Lawyers, completely overturned this singular doctrine. If we were to admit its validity, then, unquestionably, Ireland was, in 1832, in a state of "Rebellion." Throughout the whole year, meetings coming within this definition, assembled in different parts of the country. Magistrates were dismissed for attending them; parties were prosecuted for speaking at them—Tithes remained unpaid; no distress could be sold; and in some cases, the Parson, while endeavouring to get what he called "his own," caused death—in other cases the people resisting payment, committed outrages, and were guilty of murder. Such was the state of Ireland in 1832. This lamentable condition of the country was aggravated by the conduct of STANLEY. SHEIL, in his place in Parliament, charged him with having a personal interest in upholding the Tithe system. He is a large lay impropiator. The charge STANLEY haughtily, nay, contemptuously denied. Be that as it may, he undoubtedly showed every disposition to protect the system, and secure the claims of the Protestant Clergy.

He brought in a measure, at the commencement of the year, which from its coercive nature, afterwards produced violent commotion throughout Ireland. It was founded on the following resolutions:—

“ That, in order to afford relief to this distress, it is expedient that his Majesty should be empowered, upon application to the Lord Lieutenant, or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, to direct that there be issued from the Consolidated Fund, such sums as may be required for this purpose.

“ That the sums so issued shall be distributed by the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, in advances proportioned to the incomes of the incumbents of benefices, wherein the tithes or tithe composition, lawfully due may have been withheld; according to a scale diminishing as the incomes of such incumbents increase.

“ That for the more effectual vindication of the authority of the law, and as a security for the repayment of the sums so to be advanced, his Majesty be empowered to levy, under the authority of an act to be passed for the purpose, the amount of arrears for the tithes or tithe composition of the whole or any part of the year 1831; without prejudice to the claims of the clergy for any arrear which may be due for a longer period; reserving, in the first instance, the amount of such advances, and paying over the remaining balance to the legal claimants.

“ That it is the opinion of this house, with a view to secure both the interests of the Church and the lasting welfare of Ireland, a permanent change of the system will be required; and that such a change, to be satisfactory and secure, must involve a COMPLETE EXTINCTION of tithes, including those belonging to lay impropiators;

by commuting them for a charge upon land, or in exchange for an investment in land."

Thus it will be seen that the Government determined to coerce the people to pay this obnoxious Tax; and to be themselves its Collectors—or rather, to employ the British Army in the unholy work. To palliate that despotism, a phrase, carrying deceit on the very face of it, was inserted in the Resolutions, viz.:—the words "THE COMPLETE EXTINCTION OF TITHES." The Resolution for the levy of the arrears exasperated the people; and the delusiveness of the promised EXTINCTION, threw them into a state of the utmost excitement. We have no hesitation in saying, that these words were the indirect cause of the Gurthroe, Wallstown, Castlepollard, and other massacres; for they gave an assurance to the Nation, which was not realised; promising that, in no shape or form, should the impost be demanded, and thus increasing the existing determination not to pay. When, therefore, notwithstanding this material pledge of extinction, the demand was made, it was resisted, and bloodshed was the result. It was one of the most untoward expressions ever written. We are aware that the Ministerial meaning was, that another mode of payment, or rather payment made in another name, was to be enforced. But the people could not give plain words other than their ordinary signification; and no sophistry could persuade them, that EXTINCTION meant NON-EXTINCTION.

The leading events, then, of 1832, were the struggle against Tithes; the discussion of the Irish Reform Bill; and the fearful Agitation in England, in consequence of the KING's refusal to create new Peers, on the virtual rejection by the Upper House, of the English Reform Bill. We will find O'CONNELL's history intimately connected with these three measures.

Whilst O'CONNELL was most anxious to keep alive political agitation, so long as a grievance remained to be redressed, he was equally desirous to keep the people within constitutional bounds, and maintain tranquillity in the country. His knowledge as a lawyer gave him immense power over their minds; and this power he used for their benefit. He was an advocate for constant AGITATION. A beautiful figure, he often used, will illustrate his opinions on this subject—"Water which is scattered
" in luxuriant and fertilizing streams over the land,
" would be a mephitic lake, from which poison and
" death would spring up, but for salutary Agitation." So with the condition of Ireland. Her grievances should be agitated, in order to secure her amelioration. Entertaining such opinions, he commenced this eventful year, by publishing an Address to the People of Ireland, calling on them to give up religious dissension, which was the bane of a land for which Nature had done much. He called on the Catholic and Orangeman to unite—he called on the "Whitefeet" and "Blackfeet" to forget their ridiculous disputes; on the "Black hens" and "Magpies" to give up their feuds; on the "Shanavests" and "Caravats"—the "Terry Alts" and "Rockites" to abandon their deeds of blood; and on Ribbonmen to forego their evil combinations. He called on all to be peaceful; and to follow his advice and his leadership in Constitutional Agitation. This remarkable Address was dated on the "First of January." It was adopted by the NATIONAL POLITICAL UNION, amidst loud acclamations, and gave a foretaste of the active movements in contemplation. The "wait-a-while" policy was altogether abandoned. It was adopted for a time, to give Reform a fair chance at and after the elections. They terminated in the triumph of that cause; and O'CONNELL again un-

furled the flag of REPEAL, which was kept floating in the popular breeze, until it was again unadvisedly withdrawn. But of that we will have yet to write. We continue to develop, in due order, the course of antecedent events.

The year 1832 opened with two affairs on O'CONNELL'S hands, of an exceedingly embarrassing nature. The first was his controversy with Dr. DOYLE, on the Poor Laws. The other was his collision with Lord CLONCURRY. He never penned letters of more galling sarcasm than those addressed to Lord CLONCURRY. Every sentence was a philippic. Lord CLONCURRY had all through sustained Lord ANGLESEY; and in doing so, he attacked O'CONNELL. It does appear rather inconsistent in one who professed the most ultra opinions on Irish Politics, nay even on Repeal itself, to have taken the course we have already seen him pursuing. But recollecting his past services, and knowing what his present views are, with respect to Irish nationality, we cannot but feel deep regret that O'CONNELL was induced to come out so pointedly against him. It might not have been "irritation;" it might have been "calculation," that induced him to take this course. The popularity of Lord CLONCURRY, if allowed to continue, would be thrown into the Government scale against the Agitation; and, therefore, as O'CONNELL said, he was determined that Lord CLONCURRY should be deprived of that popularity, which he, himself, was the means of giving him. This might have been wise policy; but we regret the circumstances that produced it.

His controversy, however, with Dr. DOYLE, was, in our opinion, the most painful affair in O'CONNELL'S political life; first, because it must have been unpleasant to him to have had a difference of any kind with a Catholic Prelate so distinguished; and next, because he was wrong—decidedly wrong. It was on the subject of the Poor-

Laws—and undoubtedly O'CONNELL was worsted in the argument. We cannot, however, avoid admiring the courteous and respectful way he conducted the controversy; but, lawyer-like, it was managed with great tact, though not marked with his usual candour. The question in dispute was, compulsory provision for the Poor, under the cautious regulations proposed by Dr. DOYLE, and which did not include the Workhouse system.—O'CONNELL was opposed altogether to the principle of a Poor Law, however modified; and stated, that when he did consent to advocate its introduction into Ireland, he did so to satisfy the popular feeling, and against his own convictions, and that he regretted having lent his aid. Those who now have experience of Poor Laws, under the Workhouse system, may be induced to adopt the views O'CONNELL maintained in the controversy. But that would not be a fair way of considering the subject. The details of a system may be bad; though against the principle no objection might be offered. The Workhouse test is a failure in Ireland; but the principle of a poor-law is the noblest product of civilization. The principle is, that no one should be allowed by the State to starve. But for this principle being in operation in Ireland, this year, even with its cumbrous and defective machinery, how many hundreds of thousands of the population would have been swept off? A poor law of some kind should never have been absent from Ireland. Private benevolence could never meet the exigencies of destitution in this country. The periodical calamities, that for centuries have visited Ireland, would have been materially mitigated, if the rich were compelled to assist, by employment, in maintaining the poor. O'CONNELL, on this subject, we always considered wrong. It is, we believe, the only subject on which we have ever held opinions different from those he cherished and maintained.

Immediately, on the assembling of Parliament, O'CONNELL appeared in his place. The session was destined to be, for Ireland and the empire, one of the most important in the history of Ireland, and it was necessary he should be at his post. A case of great importance, to be tried at the Cork Assizes, and in which he was specially retained, brought him over in March. He appeared at the NATIONAL POLITICAL ASSOCIATION, and delivered a masterly speech, in which he reviewed the existing state of things with his usual force and clearness. It would be an endless task to criticise the thousand speeches, which, in the course of this MEMOIR, we have had of necessity to peruse. They all exhibit, in a greater or less degree, his peculiar characteristics—vigour, perspicuity, eloquence, and wit. In that respect, they resemble each other; and it is only when they assist in elucidating the events of the day, that they require to be enlarged on. The speech in question, though one of his best efforts, does not demand particular observation. He reiterated his moral-force maxims—pointed with exultation to FRANKLIN'S maxim, that “there is but one path to liberty, and that is VIRTUE;” and then he recurred to the allegation, that he had pledged himself to give up agitation, if Emancipation were granted. There never was a purer invention; the very contrary being his repeated statement, to this effect—“that he was an “agitator for Catholic Emancipation, with ulterior “views.”

We come to an event in the career of O'CONNELL, in which the writer had the gratification to take a part, in honor of his illustrious countryman. We have said he was retained special for the Cork Spring Assizes; in the celebrated case of *Kearney v. Sarsfield and others*. The issue was, to try the validity of the will of THOMAS ROCHFORD, Esq., of Garrettstown, in the county of

Cork; by which Mr. CUTHBERT, his brother-in-law, a respectable merchant in the city of Cork, was left large estates, valued at £12,000 a-year. The next of kin to ROCHFORD, contested the will, on the ground of undue influence on a weak, incompetent mind. The counsel employed at this trial were the most eminent at the bar—the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, O'CONNELL, HOLMES, WOLFE, JACKSON, &c. With the exception of the cross-examination of the witnesses for the plaintiff, by O'CONNELL and HOLMES, there was, however, no opportunity for any display of their known forensic talent; as the case for the defence was suddenly given up—and the trial terminated with the expression, on the part of Justice JEBB, who presided, of his conviction, that no proof whatever was given of the incompetency of the testator.

On the occasion of this visit to Cork, it was determined by the popular party, to give him a public entry, and grand entertainment. The public entry took place on a Sunday; it being the only day on which the Trades could attend. There never before was such a demonstration. You may think of the triumphs of the Roman Consuls, or the brilliancy of a Royal Procession—but for enthusiasm, and the exhibition of devotion to country, and to the individual, nothing ever before 1832, equalled the triumphal entry of O'CONNELL into Cork. It was not a very favourable day, and the Trades—all decorated with their respective emblems, and carrying banners, bearing various devices and inscriptions, had to wait for some hours, exposed to a bleak searching wind, for the LIBERATOR'S arrival at the appointed rendezvous, about three miles from Cork. At last he arrived in an open travelling carriage, amidst the most deafening shouts from the vast assemblage. On his arrival, the head of the procession moved on, passing him in military array. It had nearly reached Cork, before the last Trade filed off

before him. The carriages of the principal citizens then followed. On his approach to the City, he was surrounded by at least half a million of people on horseback and foot—men, women, and children; and yet not an injury was suffered—not an accident occurred. It was a glorious day for Ireland. It was a noble exhibition of the peaceful yet firm determination of the people. The dinner which took place afterwards was also a gratifying manifestation of respect and attachment. At Clonmel, previously, he was similarly complimented; and subsequently, at Cashel. In fact, the utmost enthusiasm prevailed wherever he appeared. He was fond of popularity, and he now enjoyed it in ample abundance.

He returned to Dublin. He again came, as he did the previous year, into collision with the Trades Political Union. He retired from that body, because Mr. LAWLESS was admitted by “grace especial” a member, after he had been rejected by the Meath Independent Club, of which Association O’CONNELL was President, and for which he expressed a decided preference, because of the substantial services it had rendered the national cause. These collisions were unpleasant, and ought to have been avoided. They were not worthy of our GREAT COUNTRYMAN; and though, in the discharge of his duty to Ireland, he had become habituated to slander, still, it could be of no advantage, under the circumstances, to provoke such a reply as the following from Mr. LAWLESS:—

“ TO EDWARD DWYER, ESQ.

“ 4, Russell-street, 5th April, 1832.

“ SIR—I shall thank you to take my name from the list of the Political Union. I come to this determination, not from any want of the most sincere respect for the public spirit and very considerable talents which distinguish that assembly; but, received as I have been, and admitted into

the most powerful political body enjoyed by my country, I mean the National Trades' Political—powerful from the marked superiority of their talents, the unequivocal honest expression of their feelings, and their great and overwhelming numbers—I could not, after reading the letter of Mr. O'CONNELL, in which he audaciously introduces my name, I believe to serve a corrupt and interested purpose in Meath, belong to any body of which he is a member.

“ This letter of Mr. O'CONNELL is characterised by a reckless contempt of truth, and an unexampled display of gross ingratitude to a brave, generous, and faithful body of men. Until he repents of that letter, as he has of other great public errors, I would feel degraded by co-operating with him in any public effort. Though the Tribute amounted to ten times what it has been, the man who would act by me and the National Trades' Political Union, as Mr. O'CONNELL has done, will still be *poor*; for he cannot possess the national confidence. I will feel much obliged if you hand this letter to the Chairman of this day.

“ Your very humble servant,

“ JOHN LAWLESS.”

To this effusion, Mr. O'CONNELL replied as follows:—

“ I feel it my duty to move, and I hope that no opposition will be given to the motion, that Mr. LAWLESS's letter be inserted on the minutes. I wish that letter to be inserted, because it contains two distinct charges against me—the first is on the subject of the elective franchise; I wish that that reproach should remain on record. With respect to the other allusion, every one knows that were I to throw up my seat in Parliament, every species of bar emolument would be open to me.—The only feeling such accusations can leave on my mind is a determination to leave no stone unturned—no ex-

“ertion untried, to restore to Ireland her natural and
“ indisputable rights, and to make my country still more
“ my debtor !”

During O'CONNELL'S absence from Parliament, the obnoxious Tithe Bill passed the House of Commons. It was said at the time that STANLEY took advantage of his delay in Ireland, to press the measure forward.— Certain it is that his absence was a misfortune. His power (as a lawyer) of dissecting the clauses of a bill, and pointing out its defects, would have materially assisted the vigorous, but ineffective opposition, which this measure of coercion received from the Irish Members. In the meetings of the National Political Union, he powerfully enforced the injustice of the proposed law. The crown, which was bound, in all matters of a civil nature, to stand indifferent between debtor and creditor, was made to take the Tithe debtor under its special {protection—to recover the arrears for him which occurred since the agitation had begun; and without personal service of a legal notice, to sue any party returned as defaulter by the Clergymen. The writer experienced, at that time, the injustice of this law. He held land which, time out of mind, was Tithe free. A claim to Tithe from it was set up; a demand from Dublin Castle was made on him for an impost which was never before demanded or paid. He was threatened with proceedings on the part of the crown. The sum was small, and the writer having no time to engage in a Tithe contest with the Government, paid the demand under protest. The money was taken; the protest was not noticed. In the mean while, the agitation increased as STANLEY'S measure proceeded. Passive Resistance to Tithes began, and became the order of the day. Indeed, resistance was not altogether confined to the Passive policy. In Clare and other Counties, outrages occurred, which rather advanced

than retarded STANLEY's measure. Of this nobleman's talents, there can be no question; his intellect is of a high order; and for readiness in debate, and power over language, he is without a superior. But he was, at the time we now write of, a wrong-headed, arrogant, imperious, and irascible disposition, and by his conduct, had nearly driven the country into rebellion. It is a most singular circumstance, that though representing in Ireland a Liberal Government, he was the most unpopular Chief Secretary that ever filled the office; and as he happened to be what Mr. O'CONNELL called him—a *deputy over the Lord Lieutenant*, he succeeded in rendering the chivalrous ANGLESEY as unpopular as himself. Nor was his arrogant demeanour confined to the precincts of Dublin Castle. In the House of Commons, too, he was petulant and imperious. On this very question of Tithes, he took advantage of some observations which fell from Mr. PETRE, a Catholic Member, regarding the Catholic Oath, to charge the Irish Members with having, in violation of that oath, resisted his bill. He spoke of "mental reservation;" taunted Mr. SHIEL with "hollow casuistry" and "quibbling sophistry;" or, in plain words, he charged the Anti-Tithe Members with perjury. This charge has been since often repeated, to gall and mortify Irishmen, honestly struggling in the House of Commons for their country. The charge is, we need hardly say, utterly unfounded; and is made under mistaken apprehension of the terms of the oath. The same scruples existed in the conscience of the Third GEORGE; and up to 1829, in that of his exemplary successor. The Sovereign, it is true, is bound to do no act that would injure or be hostile to the Protestant religion. So is the Catholic Member of Parliament. But the act of granting religious freedom to other sects, was no violation of the Sovereign's oath; reducing to moderate limits the over-

grown Temporalities of the Established Church, could be no injury to Protestantism. The very contrary is the truth; for the less encumbered with worldly wealth Religion is, the more it flourishes, and the purer it becomes. The oath of allegiance obliges every Member of Parliament to protect property. Does he violate that solemn obligation, when he votes for the alteration in the laws affecting the rights of property? If, as Mr. O'CONNELL said, speaking of STANLEY'S charge—if it be perjury in Catholic Members to oppose the payment of Tithes, was it not equally perjury in Protestants of former days, to have altered the religion of the country from Catholic to Protestant; for the same oath existed to bind them against carrying out any such change? Unless it can be shown that Temporalities are Religion, the charge is futile and false. We only refer to it now to show the stuff STANLEY was made of, and his insulting demeanour at the time. The following letter from Mr. O'CONNELL'S pen on this subject, will place before the reader the conduct of the Chief Secretary in the light in which it was at that time regarded by the popular party:—

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE PILOT.

“ Merrion-square, 21st April, 1832.

“ SIR—I perceive that in your account of the proceedings of the National Political Union of Thursday last, I am reported to have used the word “ miscreant,” as applied to the Irish members returned on the popular interest, who have supported Mr. STANLEY'S Algerine tithe bill.

“ If I used that word instead of “ recreant,” which I ought to have applied, I am sorry for it. It was certainly too harsh a word, and I beg to apologise for using it, and to express my regret for being hurried by the indignation of the moment into such an expression.

“ But the truth is, that I had but just read the speech attributed to Mr. STANLEY, in reply to the able and manly rebuke of my friend Mr. SHEIL; and my blood was boiling with indignation at the atrocious perversion (attributed in the newspaper speech to Mr. STANLEY) of the oath taken by Catholic members of Parliament. This most foul newspaper perversion was, indeed, still more disgusting, by its being accompanied by a still more silly newspaper speech, attributed to an English Catholic—a great tithe-owner, but not a great man.

“ I had imagined that the very essence and excess of human arrogance and haughty presumption, could not pervert the plain words of a plain oath into any engagement, express or implied, on the part of the Catholic members of Parliament, not to vote as their judgment might dictate, on the subject of tithes, cesses, oblations, first fruits, Easter offerings, and pecuniary demands of the Established Church. I contemptuously deny that these things are “ religion ;” and should despise Mr. STANLEY’S intellect and feelings, if he thinks these, or any part of these, part and parcel of his “ religion.”

“ Glowing with, I trust, a just resentment, I might have used towards the *popular* supporters of Mr. STANLEY, the word “miscreant”—I retract it altogether, and substitute in its place, the milder and more accurate word “recreant.” Yes, the Irish members, returned on the popular interest, who supported STANLEY’S Algerine Tithe Bill, deserve the appellation of “recreants;” and if they do not blot it out by *actual* services before the next election, I trust that “recreant” will echo in their ears, until they shall be scouted from every hustings in this island. Certainly, they will be entitled to the votes of those only who support the tithe system.

“ Being, as I am, the decided enemy of the tithe system. but its legal and constitutional enemy, I feel myself

perfectly at liberty to procure, as soon as I can, a law for the total and unequivocal abolition of tithes and vestry cesses. I am as free to support such a law as Mr. STANLEY is to oppose it; notwithstanding the froth and fury, and gross calumnies attributed to him on this subject.

“ But the fact is, that STANLEY has been appointed to govern Ireland for precisely the reason which has regulated so many other Whig appointments; namely, because he is, of all others, the man most unfit for Ireland.

“ He is haughty—and the Irish are too proud themselves not to hate the haughtiness of others. He is most self-sufficient—and such a man trusts to his own superiority, without taking the pains to acquire minute local and practical information. He is most ill-tempered—and such a man is unfit for governing the most paltry province. He is a Protestant bigot—and his bigotry cherishes money and doctrine, with the same fervour and sincerity. He is a Protestant bigot—is he fit to govern a country substantially Catholic? He is, in his soul, a rank Tory, clinging to every existing abuse, and driven from his hold only by the not ungentle pressure of his chance allies in office. His Arms Bill is the prototype of his body and soul—tyrannical, contemptuous, and unfit for practical utility.

“ Let me allow him, as I do, good intentions, and considerable talents—so much the worse. His good intentions only make him persevere more pertinaciously in his mistaken schemes and notions; and his very talents only enable him to go farther astray, and to be more magnificently mischievous.

“ Is there nobody to ask Lord GREY whether he can put his hand to his heart and coolly declare that he thinks Mr. STANLEY suited to Ireland? If not—and surely he must say not—why is he to be continued in power in Ire-

land? Is it because he domineers over Lord GREY as he does over poor Lord ALTHORPE, and over wretched and divided Ireland? Those very qualities which make him formidable to Lord GREY and his ministry are those precisely which render him unfit for Ireland.

“ Yet, let the people of Ireland console themselves. Tithes *will be abolished by law*, in spite of all the STANLEYS that ever played the part of the angry boy or of the madman.

“ It is indeed said that he has threatened to refuse any reform bill to Ireland!!! I defy him. Refuse a reform bill to Ireland!!! To which my reply is, *naboclish*; and I again desire those who understand Greek to translate the word. I took it from the engraving near the touch-hole of one of the cannon that belonged to the Volunteers of 1782. *Naboclish*.

“ Yes, Protestants, Catholics, Presbyterians and Dissenters, are daily amalgamating. Our name is IRISHMEN. May the great GOD of charity stifle our dissensions, and increase our harmony and Christian attachment. Ireland will be herself again. Inseparably connected with England, and undeviatingly faithful in her allegiance to the Throne; yet she will, she SHALL, have her own Parliament; and STANLEY is the best possible assistance in procuring that salutary and life giving event.

“ I have the honor to be your faithful servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

STANLEY carried his first measure for the recovery of Tithe arrears. He, at a later period of the Session, introduced and carried bills to make the Tithe Composition Act compulsory, permanent, and universal. Hitherto, it was very partial in its operation; though in force since 1823, it had not extended to more than one-half the country. The Irish Repeal Members opposed these

Bills, in order to stave off all legislation on the subject, until a Reformed Parliament had an opportunity of dealing with it. It must, however, be admitted, that the Bills were improvements on the system. Had the Tithe Composition Act extended over the whole kingdom, the country would not have been disorganised as it was in 1832, by the Wallstown massacre, to which we may have occasion more particularly to refer. Wallstown is near Done-*raile*, in the County of Cork. The Reverend Mr. GAVAN was then the Protestant Incumbent. Contrary to the common law of the land, he distrained, for his Tithes, the growing crops. He took a Military force with him to effect his purpose. The people resisted, and dreadful carnage was the consequence. If the Tithe Composition Act were in force in this parish where the tragedy occurred, blood would not have been shed. To save, then, the lives of the people, STANLEY'S measure was, to a certain extent, desirable. It is true, it did not withdraw the Clergyman, as the Rent-charge Act afterwards did, altogether from contact or collision with the people. It is true, it did not make the collection of Tithes more certain; but it abolished the old system, which gave a pretext for proceedings like that at Wallstown; and it paved the way to the existing settlement, which, while it undoubtedly secures the Clergy in their incomes, secures also the People from Tithe Proctors, and all the thousand exactions which, for a series of years, were inflicted on the oppressed occupier in Ireland.

These measures did not, however, put an end to the agitation. It continued—O'CONNELL often said that he never knew a real agitation without a substantial "grievance." This was "a real agitation;" for under any form, the payment of Tithes by a Catholic people to a Protestant Clergyman, was a "substantial grievance."

It is one even at this day under its improved form. It is a mark of the ascendancy of one religious sect over the other; and without going into the politico-economical question of—who pays Tithes—the Landlord or the Tenant, the producer or the consumer; without entering into the controversy, whether there should be a Church Establishment; and, if so, to which of the religions should it be attached—without entering into these questions, we still assert, on the simple ground of feeling, that in this country the Protestant Religion should not be imposed as it is, pecuniarily and politically, on the nation; because the system is insulting, and a cause of irritation to the great body of the people.

The Tithe agitation continued—meetings were held in every direction. The City of Cork, amongst other localities, was, in those days, disturbed by a tithe-sale exhibition. It was a sale of cattle, seized by the Rev. Mr. FREEMAN, Rector of a parish called Ardnageehy. These cattle had been put up for sale before, and, as in every other instance, there was no bidder. They were then brought to Cork, and paraded along the principal streets, followed by an enormous cavalcade of farmers, all mounted, and admirably marshalled, like so many regiments of cavalry, with a gentleman wearing a green sash and uniform at their head. This gentleman, a Mr. HODNETT, was afterwards prosecuted and sentenced to imprisonment. He was arrested in one day on no less than five different warrants, grounded on different tithe charges, and had to give bail on each. The object of bringing the cattle to Cork was, in the hope that in so large a City, some person would be found to purchase. The speculation was a failure—not a bidder presented himself. Nothing could exceed the excitement of that day. A circle was formed round the cattle. They were surrounded by a multitude of the citizens, who were in

turn hedged in by the Rural Cavalry; and as each cow was put up for sale and withdrawn, no bidder appearing, the air was rent with acclamations. All classes caught up the enthusiasm, and from the very windows of the houses, handkerchiefs and hats were waving, in response to every shout from the populace. We shall never forget this scene. The cattle were not sold. Indeed, so determined at that time was the spirit of the people, that if the cattle were taken to Dublin, they would have been followed; and with the word "Tithes" branded on their bodies, or shouted after them, would never have found purchasers, no matter where they went, in Ireland. In many cases, the seizures had to be sent to England.

In the following amusing dialogue, which we extract from a speech of O'CONNELL'S, delivered in June, 1832, at a meeting of the Political Union of the London working classes, is most graphically and humorously described the system of passive resistance then pursued. We give the extract, as well to afford a short specimen of his various qualities as an orator, as for its truthfulness:—

"And how does PADDY act? Does he disobey the law? No. "PADDY," says the Parson, "you owe me £1 17s 6d." "And what may it be for, your *Riverence*?" says PAT. (Laughter). "Tithes! Paddy," "Arrah! thin I suppose, your *Riverince* gave some value forenint I was born; for devil a bit have I ever seen since (Roars of laughter.) But your *Riverince*, I suppose has law for it? Bless the law! your Honour, and sure an I wouldn't be after going to disobey it; but, plase your *Riverence*, I have no money." (Great laughter.) "Ah, PAT, but you've a cow there." "Yes, your *Riverence*, that's the cow that gives food to NORRY and the fourteen childer." "Well, PADDY, then I must distrain that

cow." "If your Honour has law for it, to be sure you will." Well, what does PADDY do? He stamps the word "Tithes" upon her side, and the Parson can't find a soul to take the cow. So he gets a regiment and a half, by way of brokers—(Much laughter)—fourteen or fifteen companies, with those amiable young gentlemen their officers, at their head, who march seventeen or eighteen miles across the Bog of Allen to take this cow; they bring the cow to Carlow; when they get there, they find a great crowd assembled; the Parson rubs his hands with glee. "Plenty of customers for the cow," quoth he to himself. The cow is put up at £2—no bidder; £1—no bidder; 10s.—5s.—6d.—1½d. (Cheers.) Not a soul will bid, and back goes the cow to NORRY and the fourteen childer (Continued cheers.)"

The Government acted their part in this contest. The golden link that bound STANLEY to the established Church, prompted him to make, in the face of experience, the effort to put down the agitation by prosecutions. He simply made "Tithe Martyrs" of his victims; and men, who otherwise would have been forgotten in a day, were raised up into notoriety, and cheered and entertained as great public benefactors by the middle and upper classes of society. A verdict of guilty, when prosecuted, was a God-send to them; so much did it alter and exalt their position. They became forthwith immortalised as Patriots. So much for the judicious Tithe warfare of the STANLEY Government of 1832.

We cannot conclude our remarks on these transactions, without drawing attention to the remarkable evidence of Dr. DOYLE, before a Committee of the House of Commons, of which E. G. STANLEY was Chairman. It is a most masterly display of deep research, on the whole Tithe system—its origin and its history. Notwithstand-

ing the sharp and pressing cross-examination of STANLEY, Dr. DOYLE, all armed, and gifted with an extraordinary power over language, completely carried the grand point in dispute. It is a treat to read his evidence ; but it is too long for insertion here. What a pity it was that this great man and O'CONNELL did not perfectly understand each other. Dr. DOYLE did not oppose Lord ANGLESEY's Government at this time. This might have annoyed O'CONNELL. When, during the year, he noticed the rumour of his taking place, he observed, with much emphasis, that when he saw how contact with the Government injured the noble mind of Dr. DOYLE, he could never think of running a similar risk. Dr. DOYLE kept himself aloof from the Repeal agitation, though he avowed himself in favor of Repeal. There does not, however, appear to have been, before the Public, any difference between these two illustrious men, except on the Poor Law principle.

As a remedy for the state of Ireland, the Conservative party were pressing Government for the Insurrection Act. Their wishes were not, until 1833, complied with. O'CONNELL boldly denounced the proposition, in the following powerful language, in the House of Commons. We shall yet advert to a far more brilliant display when we come to his memorable opposition to the Coercion Act.

“ I say this, and I say it emphatically, that if the peace of Ireland cannot be preserved without the Insurrection Act, the connexion between the two countries is not worth preserving for one single hour. I repeat that as my conviction. What is the Insurrection Act? It abrogates all constitutional authority. It goes to supersede the Judges of the Court. It takes away the power and protection of Juries. It destroys the prisoner's right of challenge, and places in the hands of a few individuals, and one or two King's Counsel, the rights and liberties

and life of every single man in the entire community.— (Hear.) Is this the law that is now sought for? I ask any man in this house, who has ever witnessed the effects of that measure, to say whether, with a heart in his bosom, he can wish for its recurrence? I ask any man who has ever seen the operation of that law in Ireland, to ask his own conscience whether he can consent that it shall be again wielded against the unfortunate people? Oh! how often have I watched and traced its progress in oppression, and bloodshed, and immorality, and tyranny, and oppression. (Hear.) Oh, how many an act of immorality has it not produced. Many a blooming, chaste, and innocent sister has been seduced to the commission of immorality, to bribe some village despot or some neighbouring Magistrate, that a brother or a father may be kept at home. (Hear.) Oh, how many a farm has been given up, and how many a home left desolate, to bribe some heartless landlord, that a father or a brother may not be transported under the operation of this law. How many a claim of right has been surrendered, and many a litigation given up, to bribe a landlord to make interest or to exert his own power as a Magistrate, in favour of some unfortunate relative, falsely, perhaps, accused under this Act. Have we not often (and the instances are on record) heard of the policeman hiding gunpowder in the thatch of the house, and sending another policeman to find it; and have not there been instances where a man has been induced, by the servant of a Magistrate, to walk out of his house after sunset; and when he had proceeded a little from his own house, overtaken by the police, purposely sent to watch him, then taken before the magisterial tribunal and transported. (Hear.) I have witnessed the horrors of that unconstitutional law; and I say that the social state is not worth preserving under the Insurrection Act. It is better that it be dissolved at once. It would

be better for Ireland to be annihilated, than cursed again with the operation of that horrible and unconstitutional enactment. The Insurrection Act marks the end of all civil government. Every species of abuse, and tyranny, and oppression, are perpetrated under its guise (Hear.) Oh, let me entreat of the Government, to abandon all idea of the Insurrection Act. Let them abandon the Government of Ireland altogether, or make up their mind to govern it according to the principles of the British constitution."

O'CONNELL'S OWN plan of pacification, as developed in a letter to the National Political Union of Ireland, dated 14th July, 1832, will be considered far preferable to the Coercion or the Insurrection Acts devised by Government. It is as follows; and, giving it, we wish for the present merely to request attention to his suggestions about a provision for the Catholic Clergy:—

"Our plan is this—first, we would extinguish the tithes, root and branch—" *Delenda est Carthago*;" the tithe system in all its bearings must disappear by act of parliament.

"Secondly—We are desirous that all existing Protestant incumbents should have a fair and just compensation made to them for their respective lives—to cease as to each individual's share as he fell off.

"Thirdly—Provision to be made for the present incumbents by the issue of exchequer bills, chargeable on a fund to be provided for that purpose.

"Fourthly—That fund to consist of the lands belonging to the church, and of a per centage on all proprietors having *above* £100 per annum. The per centage to be *very small*, up to a clear income of £500 a-year—to increase a little, but *only a little*, from that to £1000 a-year, clear income; and from that upwards, a moderate tax, in-

creasing with the income; but so light as not to be comparable with the tithes, or any thing like it—both these funds—the lands and the moderate income tax—indeed I should call it the low income tax—would afford an abundant provision for making compensation to the present incumbents, and also for many other purposes of religion and charity.

“ Fifthly—In future there should not be more Protestant clergymen paid by the State, than such as should be necessary for the Protestant population of the Established Church.

“ Sixthly—Small glebes, with glebe houses, suited to comfort, but not wealth, to be provided in each parish, for all other clergymen having *in that* parish a flock of at least five hundred persons. This would give a glebe to many, very many, Presbyterian clergymen in the North, and to almost all, if not all, the Catholic parish priests in Ireland. It has been long a favourite plan of mine, to see a provision made for a glebe and glebe house, upon certainly no extravagant scale; but still, on one giving something like comfort, for every parish priest in Ireland. What an admirable *poor law* would such a provision be, and how much relief could not the pastors of the people administer, if they had each a small independence in the parish, exclusive of their stole fees and such other emoluments as would be voluntarily given them by their respective flocks!

“ Such is the outline of our plan. It involves total extinction of tithes—total relief from church taxation, for all persons not having a *clear* income of £100 per annum—small taxation, indeed, on the smaller incomes above that sum, and upon no income anything like pressure or oppression.

“ It also includes present support for the incumbents

of the Established Church, during their respective lives ; and future support for as many as the Established Church Protestants should really want ; whilst it would give the Presbyterian and Dissenting clergymen, *having flocks*, either a more ample *regium donum*, or glebes and glebe houses. It would, lastly, give to the Catholic parish priests, that which they so much want—a glebe and a manse, or glebe house, rent free.

“ I trust we shall yet be able to realise this plan ; and I think we shall, if the people *obey the law*, and do not put themselves into the power of their enemies by any breaches of the peace or other outrages.”

We now turn to another feature in the history of that year, as connected with the life of our illustrious countryman. The English Reform Act was, after a trying struggle, carried through the House of Commons. Fifty-six Boroughs in Schedule A, were sent to the tomb of the Capulets. The Irish Representatives won this victory for England. There was a majority of English, and a majority of Scotch Members against the Bill ; there was so large a majority of Irish members for it, that it was carried. This debt of gratitude was not, by the way, afterwards recollected by England. But let that pass. In the Lords, the Bill was read a second time. This, it may be supposed, established the principle of the Bill. In Committee, it was thought that mere details would be considered. But it was not so ; the eminently clever LYNDHURST, was, if not the leader, the manager of his Majesty's opposition. It was already known that the sentiments of King WILLIAM had undergone a change. He was under petticoat government. Lord HOWE, the Chamberlain of the QUEEN, was dismissed, because, in the Commons, he voted against the ministerial measure of Reform. He was dismissed

without even consulting the QUEEN. She could never forget the slight ; she swayed the KING's mind, and it soon became clear that WILLIAM, THE REFORMER, was, to say the least, indifferent. LYNDHURST acted on this information. The Lords were safe ; they could not be swamped ; vulgar plebians, even men of foreign birth—was not the noble Baron himself an American?—would not be intruded on them, and they might make the essay safely and destroy the Bill. Accordingly, though the principle of Reform was admitted by the second reading, the noble American hit upon a plan to defeat the measure. Disfranchisement in the representation, and enfranchisement in the voting qualifications, were the two leading principles of the Bill. Enfranchisement in the representation was a secondary matter. The rotten Boroughs, and the unconstitutional power of the Lords, in nominating members of the Commons, were the great causes of complaint. It was undoubtedly a grievance, that London, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, &c., had not more representatives ; but compared with the aristocratic tendency of the nomination system, the grievance was a trifle. Lord GREY, then, was as much bound up with the disfranchising clauses of the Bill, as regarded the representation, and with the enfranchising provisions, as respected the elective franchise, as he was with the principle of the Bill. In fact, they were its principle.—Well, what did LYNDHURST do ? He moved, in Committee, that the disfranchising clauses, as regarded representation, should be entered on first.—His object was, by adopting those clauses first, to show the KING that they, the Tories, were Reformers, in the true sense of the word :—next, to sooth the irritation of the people ; and afterwards, by the aid of the great boroughmongers in the House, to reject the disfranchising clauses, and thus

virtually defeat the Bill. He proposed his motion, and succeeded in carrying it, by a majority of THIRTY-FIVE. Lord GREY immediately waited on the KING, and as it was impossible for him, under existing circumstances, to retain the Government, without the creation of New Peers, he proposed that step to His Majesty. It was declined ; and the Ministers resigned their seals of office. Their resignation was accepted. Nothing could exceed the consternation this occasioned. Lord EBRINGTON, who took a leading part in public affairs, proposed an Address to the KING, praying that no Ministry should be appointed, not pledged to Parliamentary Reform. Mr. HUME gave notice he would propose that the sittings of the House should be declared permanent. In the debate on Lord EBRINGTON'S motion, O'CONNELL took a leading part; having undertaken, in a brilliant speech, to answer the sophistry of PEEL. In Birmingham, a vast monster meeting was held ; and it was there proposed—the proposition would have been carried into effect, had subsequent circumstances called for it—to MARCH UPON LONDON. Westminster also met ; and O'CONNELL there addressed the excited multitude. In that speech, he complained of the conduct towards himself of the Whig Government. “ But,” said he, “ their conduct to so humble an individual as I am, is now out of the question : let it be buried in oblivion ; for the time is arrived when the people of England and Ireland must unite, and rid themselves of despotism of every kind, political and religious.”

In the meantime, the Duke of WELLINGTON was commissioned to form a Government. The KING, in the first instance, sent for LYNDHURST, as his former Chancellor, to consult him. His Lordship applied to WELLINGTON, who undertook to come to the KING'S aid, on precisely

the same principle as he consented, though in favour of the Corn Laws, "to carry on the QUEEN'S Government," as a free trader. He was a soldier, and obedience was his first and guiding principle. His Sovereign wanted his services—that was sufficient for him. Though we may admire the loyalty of this course, it is not possible to justify it in a politico-moral point of view. It would totally destroy public honesty, and the necessary *prestige* which ought surround public men, if such laxity of political principle were permitted. The DUKE'S acceptance of office caused great excitement: nay, astonishment; because it was well known, that the KING would not repudiate the sentiments expressed in his speech from the throne. But the people had no confidence in WELLINGTON; and while all were apprehensive lest he should form a Government, all parts of London were placarded with these words—"TO STOP THE DUKE—RUN FOR GOLD." The Duke was stopped, however, by PEEL and his followers. They refused to recant their opinions, and WELLINGTON thereupon threw up his Ministerial commission. Lord GREY'S Government was recalled. The Duke's party absented themselves during the progress of the Bill, through the House of Commons, to save the KING from the necessity which he was most anxious to avoid—of creating Peers in large numbers. The result was, the speedy triumph of REFORM, without a Revolution. By timely concession, the KING saved the Country. Nothing could exceed the unpopularity into which he—WILLIAM THE REFORMER—the "GO A-HEAD—the beloved of the people, suddenly fell. He and his QUEEN were groaned and hissed whenever they made their appearance in public. The impediments to Reform were attributed to the QUEEN, and to the Earl of MUNSTER, the KING'S eldest illegitimate son. That the reader may understand the state of excitement in those days, we insert a celebrated article from

the *Times*, written on the resignation of Lord GREY, and for which Lord LYNDHURST called on the Government to prosecute the proprietors. It is indeed a remarkable article and deserves preservation here :—

“ Amidst the wreck of a nation’s hopes, which has just taken place, and under the heavy dispensations with which it has pleased Providence to afflict this devoted land, it is curious to trace, and to develop to the public, even though no ultimate good may result from it, the low and dirty tricks by which the people’s enemies in the House of Lords have accomplished their ends. The prime movers of the plot were the high-principled Lord LYNDHURST, who considers political intrigue consistent with the duties of a criminal judge, and the popular and respected Lord ELLENBOROUGH. To these were joined Lord ROSSLYN, and a Noble Earl in whom disappointed ambition has caused the abandonment of the principles professed, and the friend who cherished, during a long life, and whose unwearied ability and hostility have pursued the late Ministry, from the dawn of their career down to the scene which closed it on Wednesday last. The Duke of WELINGTON, though joined with these worthies, prudently kept himself in the back ground. By these men the plan of the postponement of schedule A was concocted ; and they lured the too-confiding and now indignant Waverers, by promising them their support in the alteration which it was their wish and intention to make in the Bill. The ultra-Tories—the NEWCASTLES, MANSFIELDS, &c.—men, who, however mistaken in their principles, are at least honest in the possession of them, were yet more grossly and unworthily deceived; for they were induced to join in the vote for postponement, without being told a syllable of the intended declaration of Lord ELLENBOROUGH, in favour of “ scot

and lot" Reform. Indeed, the Noble Earl to whom we have before alluded has, since the debate, taken very great credit to himself and his co-conspirators for having delayed the Elephant Lord's declaration till after the division. "That," said he, "was admirably managed; for had the declaration in favour of Reform taken place early in the evening, we, instead of the Ministers, should have been left in a minority." What a specimen of unworthy trickery does this one sentence open on us! And yet it is to men capable of such conduct, that the deluded SOVEREIGN of this country is willing to intrust the destinies of his people. So much for the intrigues of the House of Lords; those of the Court are still less creditable. What shall we say to the eldest born of the Sovereign—to him whom Ministers, at the risk almost of their popularity with the country, elevated to a high rank in the peerage? What shall we say to his gratitude to the creator, when we hear that he has been among the foremost intriguers against him and his Government; and that he has effected a reconciliation with his father, (who, worn out with his unreasonable demands, had forbid him the presence) upon the pretext of his anxiety to assist in delivering him from the thraldom of the liberal Ministry? It is now a notorious fact, and in truth a most curious one, that at the audience of leave which the Ministers had of their SOVEREIGN on Wednesday last, the latter pressed the Duke of RICHMOND to desert his colleagues, and continue in his service; which that high-minded nobleman at once refused. "Nay, a greater far" than even the Duke, was subjected to the like blandishments and entreaties; urged, too, with a force and pertinacity, which, coming from a MONARCH, are difficult to be refused. The CHANCELLOR was pressed; again and again, to continue in his high office; and at

once, and peremptorily, though most respectfully refused. Surely, his MAJESTY must, when he made these attempts have forgotten that bloody record in the House of Brunswick,—that awful moment, when the too seductive persuasions of his father, induced the amiable but too yielding CHARLES YORKE, to abandon his principles and his colleagues, and to accept of the Great Seal. That ill-fated man, as it is well known, retired full of remorse from his SOVEREIGN'S presence, and put an end to his own existence. Fortunately for themselves and for the country, the persuasions of the son were tried upon tempers and minds of firmer mould and firmer principles. Of those who for a length of time have worked upon the mind of our unhappy MONARCH, and have induced him, after having promised a creation of Peers whenever they might be necessary for the success of the Reform Bill, to withdraw that promise, and in fact to betray his Ministers, we wish not to speak. They are persons whose situations, if not their minds, ought to have made them above such mean trickery; while their affection to his MAJESTY should have prevented their offering such fatal, such ruinous advice. Verily, they have their reward, in the contempt and abhorrence of a free, yet loyal people. It is, however, impossible not to draw a parallel to these times, and these cabals, from history. When the popular NECKER was called to the Administration in France, he was hailed by the applause of the people, and by the hopes of all those who wished for the good of the country. But his projected Reforms—his ameliorations of the state of the people—above all, his economies and retrenchments, were viewed with a jealous eye by the Court. The *female* cabal who ruled over LOUIS XVI. effected his overthrow by calumnies, dexterously and unceasingly poured into the ears of the

KING ; and the bold, the reckless, the disreputable CALONNE was put in his place. The consequences of this disastrous change are well known. May the omen be far from us, and may the example of history prove a lamp to guide us in our path ; and not an *ignis fatuus*, to lure us to our destruction."

O'CONNELL also gave expression, in a letter to the Reformers of Bristol, to his sentiments at this momentous crisis. The letter is sufficiently concise to allow of its insertion here. He thus addresses the Secretary of the British Political Union :—

“ London, May 9, 1832.

“ SIR—I had the honour to receive the invitation which you were authorised by the Bristol General Union to transmit to me to attend their next meeting. I am much gratified by the kind and flattering terms in which you have been pleased to communicate to me that invitation. I am exceedingly proud of the invitation itself, and I should be most happy to show my sense of the compliment thus paid me, by attending the meeting ; but you, and my brother Reformers of Bristol will do me the justice to recollect, that, as the real representative of one of the most populous counties in Ireland, I have important duties imposed on me, which do not admit of my absence from Parliament at the present most awful crisis. Every hour may make the single vote and humble voice of so ungifted an individual as myself of value to the liberty and peace of the people of these realms. The question is now, thanks to the intrigues and follies, as well as the vices, of the Tory faction, brought to an issue. It is now to be decided whether Englishmen and Scotchmen will tamely submit to be trodden under foot, plundered, and insulted by a sordid aristocracy of boroughmongers ; who have already loaded

the country with a debt of one thousand millions, and inflicted pauperism and decay upon the most industrious, the most economic, and the most skilful people on the face of the globe. These are the times to try men's souls. Britons! will you be the slaves of an untalented and peculating faction?—Creatures whose stunted intellects would disable them from earning an honest livelihood at any ordinary trade, and therefore deem themselves entitled to riot on the treasure, and indeed in the blood, of the British people. I repeat my question—Britons! will you be slaves; and slaves to the most degraded faction that ever dared to trifle with human liberty?

“ I can answer for the sympathy and support of the people of Ireland—the insulted and long calumniated, but the moral, the patient, and the brave people of Ireland. Brave as you are yourselves—they could not be more so—but trained in the school of lengthened oppression, they have been taught, and they easily learned the lesson, that there is no prospect of political amelioration through the paths of turbulence and violence; nor any other route to freedom save through the road of constitutional, legal, moral, and persevering exertions.—Chilled by no defeat—subdued by no resistance—they (the Irish people) persevered in their legal course, until they obtained the triumph of the principle of freedom of conscience, and powerfully contributed to obtain civil rights for the Protestant Dissenter of England, before they achieved political equality (it was all they desired) for themselves.

“ Allow me then to recommend the example, as I respectfully do, of the people of Ireland to you. Let your conduct be legal—but let it be determined; let it be peaceable—but let it also be bold and resolute; let the

display of your natural strength be tranquil—but let it be irresistible. Combine every good and honest man with you in the present glorious struggle for the rescuing of the rights of Englishmen from the fangs of the corrupt, sordid, peculating, boroughmongering aristocracy. Shame on them and their supporters! Let a civil excommunication surround the slaves—let no man salute them—let no virtuous woman speak to them—may they become the outcasts of their own sex and the contempt of the other. But let every honest Reformer now rally round the constitutional standard of just and salutary Reform. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.

“ Mr. T. W. RAWLE, Bristol.”

There was no doubt that the English Reform Bill was safe, and that the Irish Reform Bill would also become law. It was under these circumstances that O'CONNELL addressed his remarkable letter to the “ POLITICAL NATIONAL UNION OF IRELAND, commencing with the words. “ These are the times to try men's souls.” His object was, to prepare the people for an *immediate* dissolution of Parliament. In that letter we read the following passage—“ I am convinced, if we could combine both “ bodies together—that is, the Trades Union and the Po-
“ litical National Union—we should, unless in that com-
“ bination we created dissension or dissatisfaction, pro-
“ duce an instrument highly calculated, not only to ad-
“ vance the cause of Reform, but, what is of infinitely
“ more importance, to procure that measure, without
“ which it is my solemn, conscientious, and unalterable
“ opinion, Ireland cannot prosper—THE REPEAL OF THE
“ LEGISLATIVE UNION.”

He then alluded to a passage which occurred in a

speech he made in Bath, a few days before, at a meeting of the POLITICAL UNION of that town. The passage, when it appeared, was canvassed, and produced a marked sensation in Ireland. It was as follows :—

“ The Irish have been accused of wishing to have a separate Legislature, and to be divided entirely from England. Nothing can, however, be more untrue than this. We are too acute not to be aware of the advantages which result, particularly to ourselves, from our union with this country. We only want a Parliament to do our private business ; leaving the national business to a national assembly ; for it is well known to all those who are acquainted with the subject, that the private business of the House of Commons, if properly attended to, is quite enough to occupy its entire consideration. Each of the twenty-four States of North America, has its separate legislature for the dispatch of local business ; while the general business is confided to a National Assembly—and why should not this example hold good in the case of Ireland ?”

In reference to this much discussed passage, he thus wrote :—

“ Having suggested, then, three topics for my humble recommendation to the Political Union, the first of which may be easily deferred for further consideration ; but the two last of which are of immediate and pressing importance, I should conclude this long letter, but that I feel it incumbent on me to notice a recent calumny on me, and which has filled many a column of the “ Gossett Gazettes.” Let me observe, by way of parenthesis, that the young GOSSETTS, the gosling GOSSETTS, have been lately on the pension list. How long they are to remain there is quite another subject.

“ The calumny I allude to is founded upon the report of a speech delivered by me at the Political Union of

Bath. It was, I think, impossible for any honest or fair man to read that report, without perceiving that my meaning was mistaken or perverted by the Reporter. I think it was only mistaken, and that the wilful perversion has been altogether at the Irish side of the water. Indeed if you substitute the word *connexion*, which I used for *union*, which is reported, every difficulty vanishes, and my consistent support of the Repeal of the UNION, with my equally consistent support of the preservation of the CONNEXION, are perfectly manifest.

“ I, however, put the matter thus of doubt. I never said, or could say, one word of the utility to Ireland of the Union, I would rather die than assert so gross a falsehood. I did speak of the utility of the connexion.

“ Let me here remark, that the zeal of those who are paid for endeavouring to lessen my influence, to fix upon me an abandonment of the Repeal, gives me the greatest satisfaction. It bespeaks a “ bye-gone conclusion,” and shows that those persons themselves are aware how deep the interest is which the people of Ireland take in the Repeal question—how intense is their anxiety for that measure—how it overpowers every other sentiment of a political nature relative to Ireland. This consciousness my calumniators exhibit, and I thank them for it. They are wise in their generation; and know that nothing could, as nothing ought, so to disgust the honest men of Ireland, as any tergiversation on this all important subject.

“ I, therefore, notice this especial calumny. I proclaim it totally false. I spoke at Bath of the value of the *connexion* to both countries—to England as well as to Ireland. I denied that by seeking the repeal of the Union we desired or tended to a separation. On the contrary, I declared my conviction that instead of producing, it would prevent the separation of the two coun-

tries. I propounded a plan of federal connexion, which I have often stated at public meetings, and in the public papers, in Ireland. It was this—that there should be again two parliaments—this, of course includes the total repeal of the act of Union—that the Irish parliament, Lords and Commons, should meet early in October in each year—that the British parliament should also assemble at the same time—that not only all private bills at each side, but all laws relative to the concerns, commerce, agriculture, and judicial system of each nation, should belong exclusively to the local and domestic parliament of each, separately. This, of course, would take away the appellate jurisdiction over Ireland of the English House of Lords. That in the latter end of January, or beginning of February, in each year, the Imperial Parliament should sit for all great national concerns, relative to peace, war, colonies, foreign relations, and other matters, by which all the inhabitants of both countries may be affected. In such a parliament, Ireland should have her *fair proportion* of members.

“Such was the proposed plan of Repeal, which I briefly, but, I thought, distinctly propounded. This may not be the best plan. I never said *that*—but I believe it to be the most practical plan for the Repeal of the Union; and it is quite plain, that if it did not work well in practice for Ireland, it would, at all events, afford the most ready, and the very best materials, for restoring the legislative independence as in 1782, and effectuating the political change, without bloodshed, confusion, or violence of any kind, to person or to property.

“Having thus at length given this refutation, I have only to add these two things:—*First*—That this, my plan, is one which I have not, and do not presume to dictate. I am not wedded to it. I embrace it, because it affords

great facilities of execution, destroys the false accusations of our desiring separation, and would not interfere with even the pride of Englishmen. I think it a practical plan, but I am open to conviction on this subject; and if I am shown that I am wrong, I am ready to abandon it. But, *Secondly*—I never did, I never will, I never can abandon my anxious desire for the Repeal of the Union. This is a subject on which I have pledged myself; and I solemnly and deliberately repeat that pledge to the people of Ireland. I deem that Repeal essentially necessary to Irish prosperity. I am unalterably convinced, that Ireland cannot possibly prosper without it—that is, without a local and domestic parliament, which would and should render the system of absenteeism impossible. I pledge myself to use every *suitable occasion* to promote that Repeal; and never to omit, as I believe I have never omitted, any available opportunity to advance the interests of the cause of the legislative and constitutional independence of Ireland.”

The writer is particularly desirous of preserving this passage, as it will tend to elucidate transactions in connexion with the opinions of Mr. O'CONNELL, on this question; and the more particularly, as these opinions happen in every respect to coincide with those the writer adopted and advocated in print, long before either SHARMAN CRAWFORD or O'CONNELL wrote on the subject. SHARMAN CRAWFORD's plan was vague and inadequate. It was scarcely worth contending for; as it would make the Irish Parliament subordinate to that of England. It was what O'CONNELL afterwards called “a small federalism.” Mr. O'CONNELL's plan, on the contrary, if he were allowed to carry it out, would give Ireland an INDEPENDENT LEGISLATURE, for the management of her own affairs; while it would not exclude her from a fair control, by

an adequate number of members in the Imperial Parliament, over the general concerns of the Empire. This was, as he said himself, a more enlarged plan than a local Parliament; and it was more likely to ensure union amongst all classes of Irishmen; because it would remove the apprehension of Protestants, that without England's protection, their religion or their properties would not be secure. Steadily and without shrinking, the writer, through good report and bad, maintained the same views. But as the object was the REPEAL OF THE UNION, he went with his great Leader, without paltering about details; knowing well what the LIBERATOR'S own views were, though the spirit of party amongst even the Repealers, prevented him, unfortunately, carrying those views out, and testing the Ulster Protestants on the point of Legislative self-control.

But the immediate question under our consideration is, REFORM. The English and Scotch bills being disposed of, we have to examine the amount of relative justice done to Ireland. We will examine that question, assisted by the light of O'CONNELL'S wisdom, and our own experience. But first, let us direct attention to his celebrated speech on the question of Irish Reform. It was one of the best he ever delivered in Parliament:—full of sparkling wit, impassioned eloquence, unanswerable argument, and keen humour. He kept the House in a continued roar of laughter, at the expense of Recorder SHAW, who was the leader of the Irish Opposition to the Bill, brought in by STANLEY. It appeared that the Dublin Corporation, when they heard of WELLINGTON'S being summoned to the KING'S Councils, shipped their State Coach, and brought it to London, for the purpose of taking their LORD MAYOR to present an address of

congratulation to his MAJESTY. The Duke failed, and the coach was sent back. No address was forthcoming. Recorder SHAW would have had a seat in this vehicle, had matters occurred as the loyal Corporation expected. O'CONNELL took advantage of this incident, and turned the poor Recorder into the utmost ridicule, to the great delight of the whole House. The whole speech is a most successful piece of Parliamentary oratory.

But he struggled against SHAW for a meagre miserable measure. Nothing can more strongly show the difference in the Government of both countries than the relative extent of Reform granted both. To this day, we are suffering from the wretched machinery with which the Irish Reform Act is encumbered. But the injustice done to Ireland, whose Representatives won Reform for England, we will endeavour to unfold, by a brief abstract of Mr. O'CONNELL'S celebrated letters to the Reformers of England, published at this time. They are too long for insertion here. Amongst his speeches and memorable letters, they are sure to be preserved and given to the public by a competent compiler. Then we will find he was the most prolific writer that ever lived—not excepting the Spanish Dramatist, with his thousand plays—or the great AUGUSTINE, or the indefatigable VOLTAIRE.

O'CONNELL'S objections to the Irish Reform Bill, as embodied in these letters to the Reformers of England, may be thus stated—

Firstly—That the Bill diminished the elective franchise instead of extending it.

Secondly—That the qualification for a voter, both in boroughs and counties, was too high.

Thirdly—The complicated nature of the system for the registry of voters.

Fourthly—The inadequate number of Representatives Ireland possessed.

Fifthly—The inadequate number of Representatives given by the Bill.

The very objections he advanced against the measure, before it became law, are now with truth urged against it, after an experience of fourteen years.

By the substitution in Counties of the ten pound beneficial interest franchise, for the forty shilling freehold, he proved the disfranchisement of TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND VOTERS. He enumerated twelve counties, principally Northern, where there were together one hundred and ten thousand six hundred and twelve forty-shilling freeholders. These, by the Bill, would be disfranchised; and but nine thousand three hundred and fifty-one ten pound voters substituted. In fine, there would be, in a population of eight millions, but twenty-six thousand voters; while the English would get one hundred and fifty thousand in addition to the two hundred thousand they already possessed. He then gave the following list of franchises in each county. England had—

“ The franchise of forty-shilling freeholders for a life or lives. This franchise does not require occupation of the freehold by the freeholder, but it expires with the present race of possessors.

“ The franchise of 40s. freeholders in fee-simple. This franchise is to continue in England, and does not require actual occupation.

“ The franchise of £10 clear yearly value for any freehold estate, whether for life or in fee. This franchise does not require actual occupation by the freeholder.

“ The franchise of similar value to copyholders. This franchise is, for the first time, given by the English Reform bill, and introduces a numerous class of new voters.

“ The original lessee, or the assignee of a term originally of at least sixty years, of the yearly value of £10—This is a new franchise, and does not require actual occupation.

“ The original lessee, or the assignee of a term originally of at least twenty years, of the yearly value of £50. This is a new franchise, and does not require actual occupation.

“ The sub-lessee, or assignee of a sub-lease of a term not less, originally, than sixty years, with a clear profit of £10. This is a new franchise, but requires actual occupation. It is the first franchise in England, which is encumbered by the necessity of actual occupation.

“ The sub-lessee, or assignee of a sub-lease of a term not less, originally, than twenty years, of the clear annual value of £50. This is a new franchise, but it requires actual occupation.

“ Any tenant, whatsoever, liable to a *bona fide* rent of £50 a year. This is a new franchise, and requires actual occupation.

“ Such is to be the state of the elective franchise in England. It consists altogether of nine different classes of voters, and is an augmentation of former rights, by no less than seven classes, and some of those classes are multitudinous in their nature—that is, capable of giving rights of voting to many individuals out of one property. How melancholy and miserable is the contrast which the state of Ireland is destined to afford.

“ In Ireland we are to have but four classes of voters.

“ 1. The existing one, a freehold of £10. clear annual value. This franchise requires actual occupation.

“ 2. The existing right of freehold, £20 clear annual value. This does not require actual occupation.

“ 3. The lessee, or assignee of a term of originally

not less than fourteen years, of the clear yearly value of £20. This is a new franchise, and does not require actual occupation.

“ 4. The sub-lessee, or assignee of a sub-lease of a term of not less, originally, than fourteen years, of the clear annual value of £20. This is a new franchise, and requires actual occupation.

“ These are all—and thus England has, at present, two franchises, and acquires, by the reform bill, seven additional franchises. Ireland has at present two franchises, and acquires by the reform bill only two more.

“ England, a rich country, has two franchises of 40s, multitudinous in their nature, and not requiring actual occupation; four franchises of £10, one only of which requires actual occupation; besides two franchises of £50 annual value, one only of which requires actual occupation; and one franchise of mere payment of £50 a-year rent.

“ Mark the contrast with Ireland—Ireland, a poor country, has no 40s. franchise, has only one £10 franchise; and even that franchise requires actual occupation. Ireland has then but three franchises of the enormous value *to us* of £20 annual value, and one of these three requires actual occupation.

“ To put this matter in a still more clear point of view—let me take in England a single estate worth £50 a year, and in the hands of an occupying tenant who pays that rent for it. Now, such a property as that could, in England, qualify no less than twenty-six persons to vote; while in Ireland such a property could not possibly qualify more than three persons to vote.

“ Thus, in new franchises, the English bill is seven to two better than the Irish. In popular character, as arising from property, it is more than eight—very nearly nine to one, better than the Irish one; and let it always

be recollected, that this difference is enormously aggravated by the fact that Ireland is, beyond comparison, the less wealthy country."

Having thus clearly drawn the contrast, he demanded for Ireland the following franchises:—

"First—The perpetuation of the franchises of all *resident* freemen, entitled to their freedom as of right, by birth, servitude, or marriage.

"I ask for this franchise, because it is in substance preserved in the English borough towns, and is reasonable in itself.

"Secondly—I ask that, in our towns and cities, being counties in themselves, the occupying freeholders in fee, or of perpetual freehold of 40s and upwards, should be preserved as they are in England.

"Thirdly—I ask that, in such towns and cities—that is, being counties in themselves, the £20 freeholders, though not occupying, should be allowed to vote.

"Fourthly—In the towns, not being counties in themselves, occupying freeholders of 40s, seized in fee, or of perpetual freehold, should be allowed to retain, as in England, the elective franchise.

"Fifthly—I ask, that the occupiers of houses of £5 annual value, instead of £10, should be allowed to vote. This is the old, long recognised right of household suffrage in Irish towns. It ought not to be destroyed, or infringed upon; and LEAST OF ALL, should it be wantonly destroyed, by a bill purporting to be a Reform Bill.

"There is only one alteration more that I seek in this section of the Reform Bill—it is, that it should not annihilate the right of any freeholder in towns, not being Counties of themselves, to vote for the County at large. This right at present exists only in occupying freeholders of twenty pounds and upwards, clear value. Why

should their rights be destroyed, under the pretence—the false pretence—of a Reform ?”

It will be perceived that he was in favor of perpetuating the resident freemen. His leanings to the extension of the franchise led him into that mistake ; for it was a mistake to perpetuate, either in England or Ireland, that description of franchise. Experience has shown how detrimental it has ever been to the advancement of popular liberty and right.—Yes, O'CONNELL, when the English Bill was under discussion, ought not to have advocated the preservation of the Freemen as voters. He ought to have suspected that all was not right when WEL-LINGTON, the leader of the Anti-Reformers, proposed they should be retained. Neither should he have ceased to struggle against the Fifty Pound Tenant-at-will Franchise. He ought to have had his suspicions awakened, when he found it proposed by Lord CHANDOS, now Duke of BUCKINGHAM. These portions of the Reform Act were unfortunate additions ; for the franchises thus created, have retarded, and will still retard, the progress of social and political ameliorations in both countries. Holding the eminent position O'CONNELL did, at that period, in Parliament, had he vigorously supported the Government in resisting these clauses, in all likelihood they never would have become law. But he acted on a fixed principle, the value of which no one can deny—and of which it was then not easy to foresee the consequences. Lord ALTHORPE certainly did foresee them ; but he was obliged to yield, because he was not sustained by his own friends.

To return. O'CONNELL, in his letters to the Reformers of England, next complained of the inadequate number of representatives given to Ireland. “ Mark,” he said, “ the enormous preference given to England.

“The county of Cumberland, with a population of only 169,681 gets two additional members—that is, it will in future send four members to Parliament.

“The County of Cork, with a population of 807,366, does not get one additional member. It will continue to send two only.

“That is just saying, in so many words, 169,681 people in Cumberland, are of twice as much value in Parliament, as 807,366 in the county of Cork. Ask for a reason, Oh, the smaller number are English—the greater are Irish—Q. E. D.

“Northamptonshire gets two additional members. Another Cabinet Minister sits for it. Its population is only 179,276. It will send four members to Parliament.

“Down has a population of 352,571. It gets no increase of members.

“Leicestershire has 197,276 inhabitants. It increases its representatives from two to four.

“Tipperary has 402,598 inhabitants. It must be content with two members. I, however, doubt much, whether Tipperary will be satisfied.

“Worcestershire, with a population of 211,356, is to have four representatives.

“Galway county, with a population of 427,407, remains with two.

“Wiltshire, with only 239,181 inhabitants, is to command four representatives.

“Tyrene, with 302,948 inhabitants, is to have but two.

“Nottinghamshire has 225,320 for its population; accordingly it is to have four members.

“Antrim county has 328,306 for its population; accordingly it is to have but two representatives.

“Derbyshire has a population of 237,170—it will have four members—STANLEY is at home here I suppose.

“ Dublin county has a population of no less than 386,694—Not one additional member—not one.

“ But why should I pursue the painful, the humiliating contrast? I cannot avoid noticing just one instance more.

“ Monmouthshire gets a third member, though its population is but 98,130.

“ Mayo with 367,953; Limerick with 300,080; Clare with 258,262; Kerry with 219,989; Donegal with 298,104—not one of them gets an increase—not one!”

This gross injustice may be thus further demonstrated. Wales, with a population of eight hundred and five thousand two hundred and thirty-six, got an increase of FOUR members, in addition to TWENTY-FOUR it already possessed. Scotland, with a population of two millions three hundred and sixty-five thousand three hundred and seven, got an increase of EIGHT representatives, in addition to FORTY-FIVE it possessed. Ireland, with a population of EIGHT MILLIONS, got but FIVE, in addition to the HUNDRED members she already had. The flagrant injustice of this arrangement, is rendered more palpable, by considering the whole number of representatives to which, on a ratio of the population, exports, imports, and revenue of both countries, she was entitled, England having FIVE HUNDRED members. Lord CASTLEREAGH, in bringing in the measure of the Union, showed that she was entitled to ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHT members. NEWENHAM, adding rental to the respective ratios, showed she had a just right to ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINE—and excluding rental, to ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVEN members. O'CONNELL took, as his basis of calculation, population and revenue; and therefrom demonstrated Ireland's right to ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIX members; while his demand extended but to one hundred and twenty-five. The revenue of England

he showed was £48,825,215; and that of Ireland, after getting credit for the duties paid in England, on teas and other articles consumed in Ireland, came to £6,000,870, being an eighth of England's income; therefore, on the ratio of revenue, as England had five hundred members, Ireland should have SIXTY-TWO. Again, the population of England was TWELVE, that of Ireland nearly EIGHT millions—that is, two-thirds of England's. This would entitle the former to two hundred and ninety-one members. By adding the sixty-two, in right of national contributions to the Exchequer, and by taking the main, we have ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIX members, as our right, according to O'CONNELL'S calculation. We will not follow him in his elucidation of the difference between the mode of registration in England and in Ireland; the facilities in the one country, the difficulties and harassing impediments in the other. We need only say, that in this regard all his prognostications have proved correct.

O'CONNELL, holding these views, struggled with great power and force in Parliament, to obtain some improvement in the Irish Reform Bill. In this contest he had to battle single-handed, with both the government and the opposition. But his chief and bitterest and ablest antagonist was STANLEY. The system of recrimination which was pursued, was by no means becoming, in the presence of the collective wisdom. STANLEY was backed up by the House; O'CONNELL, on the other hand, was not supported as he ought to have been by his party. But, nothing daunted, he firmly persevered. In a speech delivered in 1835, he described the efforts he had made to obtain a more generous measure of Reform for Ireland, in the following words:—

“STANLEY hates Ireland, and we would have had a better chance even in the few concessions made to the

British people, of getting such a Reform Bill, at the time of the passing of that act, but for his hostile interference. I had many interviews with the ministers of that day, to induce them to extend a more liberal measure of reform to Ireland than they at first intended. I passed a day with Lord JOHN RUSSELL, and another with Lord ALTHORP, and met Mr. RICE, and had almost succeeded in convincing them of the strength of our claims. Lord STANLEY was also by on some of those occasions; I left him behind me, and afterwards found he had undone all the good I might have achieved. After all, I have no doubt, but that for me, the bill would have been even worse for Ireland. I wrote letters to the *Morning Chronicle*, at the time, and also had the corporation of London to meet in our favour; but, after all, the government of the period, parted with every concession to Ireland, as a miser would part with a half-penny. We did not get half the reform which we ought to have received."

We will give here a specimen of this systematic plan of recrimination which he had to endure, during his exertions to obtain a better measure of Reform. On the 18th of June, on the House going into a Committee on the Irish bill, O'CONNELL moved as an instruction, that the five pound qualification should be established in Ireland. His speech was exceedingly temperate. The only observation he made, which could excite the ire of the Irish Secretary, was, "that the Irish Government offended both parties, "and were neither one thing nor the other. They disgusted "all parties, while they weakened their own influence by "employing their enemies." STANLEY replied in the following terms:—

"I neither wished, nor had I the right to question the motives of the Learned Member for Kerry. I doubt not

that he is anxious to promote the cause of reform. I doubt not that he is anxious to conciliate the Protestants of Ireland. I doubt not that he is desirous to produce and to perpetuate the most kindly feelings between England and Ireland. Yet, if such be his objects, never was there a man whose public conduct so utterly belied his private wishes, or whose daily proceedings were so utterly at variance with the views he had in his mind. Does he mean to tell me that he is not the man who, before he had a seat in this house, and since he has had a seat in this house, and above all, since the present administration has come into power, has spared no pains, while he nominally gave his support to the law, to excite passion in the breasts of his countrymen? who, while he affected to preach conciliation, used all endeavours to promote disunion? who, while he professed to co-operate with the Government, never lost an opportunity of assailing each individual member of the administration with abuse, which was disgraceful not to them, but to him who uttered it, and claims the character of a gentleman? [Here the hon. member was interrupted.] The learned member for Kerry is very sensitive if the smallest obstruction be offered to his speeches. It might be decent in him, therefore, not to interrupt me in so unbecoming a manner.— With another man it might be deemed insulting, but he claims the happy privilege of neither giving or receiving insult. I, Sir, however warm I may have been in opposition, never attempted to damage private character. I should be ashamed to say, even in the utmost heat of debate, that any man, living amongst a people, cared not if they were starved in this world, and d—d in the world to come. If I had used these words in the heat of debate, I should have taken the earliest opportunity of retracting and apologising for them; if I had written them,

I should have felt myself degraded; but if I had calmly and deliberately printed them, I should look with no enviable feeling on him who hesitated to hold me up, and brand me as a convicted libeller to the country. Observe the language he has continually used; mark how he has borne himself towards me, a stranger in the country. In all the delicacy of conciliation, he never once called me an Englishman; but always applied to me the opprobrious epithet, as he meant it, and his audience understood it, of a Saxon. This is a specimen of the learned gentleman's conciliation."

Mr. O'CONNELL was not to be deterred by these attacks, from the performance of his duty to Ireland. He struggled to the last for a better Bill of Reform. He struggled against the Tithe enactment, and for a more generous consideration of the peoples' condition. He brought the subject of STANLEY'S celebrated letter to the Magistracy before the House. Thus contending against wrong, he continued at his post during this eventful Session, until the Reform Bill was passed. One of his last acts in Parliament, this Session, was to secure for his old political enemy, Sir ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING, compensation for the loss of his Patent, as Government Stationer. Compensation was refused by the Tory Government. It was put off by the Whigs. But O'CONNELL took up the case. He succeeded in convincing Lord MORPETH of the justice of the claim, and having obtained his concurrence, that of Lord ALTHORPE soon followed; and Sir ABRAHAM B. KING was secured from poverty by the LIBERATOR'S generous advocacy.

To understand the nature of the obligation due to O'CONNELL, it may be well to mention that Sir A. BRADLEY KING was, in earlier day, one of the most—nay, amongst the Dublin Corporators, the most violent

enemy of Catholics. He was the concoctor of that famous anti-Emancipation Petition, in 1813, got up in Dublin, to which so many forged signatures were attached; and which indicated, in every step taken regarding it, so much virulence and bad feeling. He was also the Lord Mayor of Dublin, during the KING'S visit in 1832. He soon forgot the conciliation which he then professed an anxiety to establish. Yet, when O'CONNELL found he had justice at his side, and that his natural friends had deserted him, he stood his only friend, and had his rights allowed. This saved him from absolute ruin—He did not forget this aid; for at the next Dublin election, Sir ABRAHAM B. KING testified, by his conduct, his gratitude to O'CONNELL, and O'CONNELL acknowledged it. Lord MORPETH, who, it is well known, would do anything for O'CONNELL, at his instance arranged this affair for him. We happen to know another instance in which the LIBERATOR acted as generous and as magnanimous a part. A Mr.—, who had done him great personal wrong, as far as abuse and slander could affect him, was appointed or about to be appointed, to a Judgeship at Demerara. Lord MORPETH asked Mr. O'CONNELL whether he had any objection to the appointment. “None, my Lord,” was the reply “except the distance.” The appointment was afterwards made for Newfoundland. The new Judge met O'CONNELL afterwards in the street, in London.—He went up to him, took him hastily by the hand, and, his utterance choked with uncontrollable emotion, said “God bless you, may God bless you;” and disappeared, without waiting for a reply from O'CONNELL, who called after him in vain.

When O'CONNELL, in 1841, was entertained by the people of Belfast, in the course of his speech on that occasion, referring to the savage conduct he experi-

enced before coming into the town, from the Orange faction, he thus spoke in reference to his exertions in behalf of SIR ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING.

“But I wish that the people of Ulster—not those congregated here, at this enlivening scene; but those who assembled to-day to bar my way on the Queen’s high road,—I wish them to know this fact, and I proclaim it here, in the hope that it will reach the murkiest region of the darkness, that is created in order to keep men in a bad feeling of mind towards their fellow creatures—that there is not a single Orangeman who ever had a just cause of complaint before the Imperial Parliament, that I was not the first person he came to—(Hear, hear, and cheers.) I have many proofs of that. All the officers of the Corporation of the city of Dublin—men who had been abusing me, hooting me, and assailing me for the space of five and twenty years; the moment an attempt was made to give them less compensation than their offices were really worth; instead of going to the Recorder, or to Dr. LEFROY, every man of them came to me. And I proclaim it here to Ulster, and I call every man of them as my witnesses, that I gave them all the assistance in my power; all I required was, to be satisfied that the claim of every man whose cause I espoused, was a just one; and as soon as that was proved, I took the Orangeman by the hand, and I supported him with all the zeal and sincerity that I would one of my own friends. (Cheers). There, for instance, the other day, three of the Aldermen of the City of Dublin; persons as little disposed to be kind to me as possible, were thrown overboard by everybody, whereupon, they floated to me—(A laugh)—and they were actually deprived of their fair turn to get into the office of Mayor; for no other reason than that they had accepted of, and ob-

tained, my assistance. But, my friends, let Ulster know that this is not the only occasion on which an opportunity offered, of showing that on questions of justice, I despised all the suggestions of party (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") The Deputy and Master of the Orangemen of Ireland—Sir ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING—he would have starved in misery and want. His Orange friends in the House of Commons, to shelter their own misdeeds, forsook him in the hour of tribulation. Were it not for me, he would not have lived for many years in comfort, in the enjoyment of an income of £2,500 a year, and he would not have got one sixpence of it, but for me. I would do as much for an Orangeman as I would for a Catholic—I'll read for you a letter from Sir ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING to me. It is well to put it into circulation, at the present moment; and let the Orangemen of Ulster see how my feelings are disposed to them, when it is in my power to render them a service. This letter is an acknowledgment from Sir ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING, of the services I rendered him. I should be glad to witness the period when the Christian world would repose under the angel wing of charity; and the creeds and professions of individuals would be forgotten, or not remembered, whilst matters of public interest were under discussion; but that politics could be treated of without religious rancour and bigotry. The circulation of the letter which I am about to read to you, may tend in some way to soothe down asperities; and go far, if not to effect the object at once, to at least prove, that the fault rests not with me. The Hon. Gentleman then proceeded to read the following letter:—

"Barnet's Hotel, Spring Gardens,

"4th Aug., 1832.

"MY DEAR SIR—The anxious wish for a satisfactory termination of my case, which your continued and un-

wearied efforts for it ever indicated, is at length accomplished. The vote for compensation passed last night.

“ To Mr. LEFROY and yourself am I indebted for putting the case in the right position to my Lord ALTHORP ; and for his Lordship’s consequent candid and straightforward act, in giving me my full dues, and thus restoring myself and family to comparative ease and happiness.

“ To you, Sir, to whom I was early and long politically opposed—to you, who—nobly forgetting this difference of opinion—and who, rejecting every feeling of party spirit, thought of my distress—and sped to succour and support me, how can I express my gratitude? I cannot attempt it. The reward, I feel, is to be found only in your own breast ; and I assure myself, that the generous feelings of a noble mind, will cheer you into that prosperity and happiness which a discriminating Providence holds out to those who protect the helpless and sustain the falling.

“ For such reward and happiness, to you and yours, my prayers shall be offered fervently ; while the remainder of my days, passed, I trust, in tranquillity (by a complete retirement from public life, and in the bosom of my family), will constantly present to me the grateful recollection of one, to whom I am mainly indebted for so desirable a closing of my life.

“ Believe me, my dear Sir, with the greatest respect and truth, your faithful servant,

“ ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING.

“ To DANIEL O’CONNELL, Esq., M.P.”

“ There is a lesson for the Orangemen. There is the language of an Orangeman to a Catholic—and Sir ABRAHAM BRADLEY KING was no ordinary Orangeman—(Hear.) He was a Deputy Grand Master of the body. (Cheers.) It is not, influenced by an idea of boasting,

nor urged on by a puerile vanity, that I allude to this ; but because it reads a lesson to the Orangemen of Ulster, and because it may divest opposing parties, in this country, of their respective hostilities, and make us all—the Orangemen included—better friends.”

We cannot better conclude this account of his career in Parliament, in 1832, than by giving at length the following beautiful sketch, from the *New Monthly Magazine* :—

“ The character of an assembly may be judged by its most popular speakers. Homely congeniality of sentiment, is more applauded than eloquent dissent ; therefore the most popular speakers, in an assembly, represent the character of that assembly. Look, then, at Mr. O'CONNELL. From the icy coldness with which that extraordinary man was received, when he first entered the house, he has risen, perhaps, to be the most attractive debater that assembly possesses. His style of parliamentary speaking has, we believe, never been sketched. Let us humbly attempt to supply the omission.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL has great advantages of person—he has all that appearance of power, which height and robust proportions invariably give to the orator, without being the least corpulent or fleshy ; without coming under CICERO'S anathema against the “ Vastus.” He has great girth of chest—stands firm as a rock—his gestures are free, bold, and warm—his countenance plays with all he utters—his mouth, in particular, indicates with great felicity the passion of the moment—frank in conciliation, bitter in scorn. Indeed the shape of the lips is rather a contradiction to the manlier traits of the orator's fine athletic person, it is so pliable in character, so delicate in outline. It indicates, according to the science of physiognomy, a quick, and even over-quick susceptibility. Eyes light, full, and clear ;

the dark *Brutus* ; the throat nervous and finely shaped—always free in the loosened neckcloth ; a small nose, but with deep set, resolute nostrils, complete a very striking and characteristic *tout ensemble*. Well, then, fancy the orator on his legs—and now for the voice. The Irish accent, in its more polished dialect, does not detract from a voice by far the most clear, flexible, and lucidly distinct you ever heard. You can't escape into a corner of that ill-built house to avoid it. Shut your ears—it will creep into them ! Yet he speaks in a much lower tone than most other speakers, and in a much mellower key. As to matter—he throws himself at once on the strong bearing of the subject—he seizes the question by its common sense. Unlike other lawyers, you never find him prying into the little holes and corners, niggling his soul into the cranny of a question. As was said of Lord CHATHAM, it is the one broad view which he takes and insists upon ; and that that view should allow him to be so popular in the House of Commons, is a striking proof how democratic that assembly has become. A week or two ago, on Mr. BUXTON's motion for the emancipation of slaves, O'CONNELL made an excellent speech ; yet in parliament, some ten years ago, it would have been called sad stuff, viz. he insisted more on justice than expediency—did not bandy words about the interests of the planter thousands, but went at once to the marrow of the matter—the interests of the enslaved millions ; ten years ago, we say, this would have been Irish declamation ; now it is Catholic truth. What is visionary to-day is only declamatory to-morrow, sensible the next day, unanswerable the day after, and a truism at last. But while taking this broad popular view of a question, while nervous, and often florid in language, O'CONNELL is not a declamatory—not an Irish—speaker in the English house. The

burning flights of that astonishing eloquence he exercises over the multitude, he seems always anxious to repress in the house—he rather figures as a debater than an orator—curbs his ardour, and puts his genius under restraint. He has sensibly improved in parliamentary speaking—he improves daily. From confidence in his powers, he is now advancing to a certainty of his superiority. His parliamentary fame is nothing to what it will be. By his occasional *puttings forth*, we may judge of what he *could* be in reply; crushing as a millstone. His answer, some time since, to Sir CHARLES WETHERELL, when that very whimsical, but singularly clever speaker, lectured him on the graces, was, to use an expressive vulgarism, thoroughly *smashing!*—so easy—so good-natured, and yet such a blow. It reminded one of the description of ULYSSES felling IRUS, when the hero—

“Checked half his might; yet rising to the stroke,
His JAWBONE dashed, the crashing JAWBONE broke,
Down dropped he stupid from the stunning wound, &c.”

“No man can combine in perfection, at the same moment, the cool, refining legislator, and popular orator. Common-place is the most popular style of eloquence in the House of Commons, and to be popular, common-place you must use; to be refined or philosophical, or speculative, is to empty the house in an instant. It is impossible to read BURKE'S speeches, and not to feel that they *could not* have been popular—not to be convinced that he *must* have been called the Dinner Bell!—But BURKE'S speeches, printed, are not entirely as they were spoken. No! for if they had been, he would have had no auditor but the Speaker!—any thing resembling them must have panic-struck the country squires; but the speeches themselves, *verbatim et literatim*, it would have been a moral

impossibility to have delivered in the house!—you might as well fancy CONFUCIUS lecturing in Chinese. So with O'CONNELL—though you may see at once that he could refine if he would—though his mind (as his great law knowledge proves) is peculiarly searching, as well as comprehensive, yet he knows too well the temper of his audience to try it in any abstruser speculation. And hence his main fault in the house, that of clinging often too much to the more hacknied as well as the broad view of a subject. If O'CONNELL's popularity prove that his general sentiments are congenial with those of the majority, we must not forget that he also consults their darling passion—an aversion to *longueurs*—he speaks at least twice every night on an average, but never seems long. Short speeches, and frequent speeches, are the best mode of obtaining parliamentary success.

“ In taking O'CONNELL as a personification of the present taste of the general body of the house in public speaking, we must be struck with one fact—the greatness and variety of this man's powers. Coming late in life into the English Parliament—feared, disliked—his very reputation as an orator almost enough to weigh him in the dust—(for how, in an assembly where oratory does not thrive, could he keep up to that reputation at first?)—a Catholic—an Irishman—an Agitator—**THE AGITATOR** —; suddenly obtruded into this chilling assembly, where GRATTAN had withered, and FLOOD had sunk—every eye upon him, but not to admire—every lip apart, but not to cheer—every ear intent, but not to be soothed—was it surprising that he failed at first?—is it not wonderfully surprising that he has succeeded so eminently at last? He is the only oak of mature age that ever bore transplanting to St. Stephen's! What wrecks of names and reputations lie around him! Literally, he—

the Irishman—the Catholic—the Agitator—the mob orator—is the only man, entering the house at that period of life, who ever obtained ultimate success. How much does that speak, not of power only, but of tact—of subtlety—of conciliation! It is impossible, indeed, to see much of O'CONNELL, without perceiving that he was formed for great and prominent positions in the world's eye. With all his power—such gentleness, such good humour, such urbanity! He could not lead without being loved by his followers—and in that lies one great secret of the unprecedented and dangerous (for all individual power is dangerous) personal ascendancy he has obtained. *What* an ascendancy! DANIEL O'CONNELL, the simple Counsellor—the private gentleman, on one hand—the moral King of Ireland on the other! 'This difference between the station and the power, where is its equal.'

We now follow the LIBERATOR to Darrynane Abbey, so celebrated as the scene of his periodical sojourn; where, mingling the healthful enjoyment of field sports with his literary pursuits, he managed to brace his constitution for the mental labours he had to endure; while he likewise kept alive the public feeling on the great topics of the day. He arrived at Darrynane in August, and until he left in October following, he wrote thirty public letters—all of great length—on subjects in which the national interests were vitally concerned. The principal subject of these letters was the mode of carrying out the Irish Reform Act. In this respect, his instructions to the Nation were necessary; for it was difficult to understand in detail the practical application of the several provisions. His letters ably explained the modes of proceeding, and thus afforded much advantage to the people in the acquisition of the franchise. At Darrynane he thoroughly enjoyed himself, like a chieftain of the

olden time. He delighted in playing the Irish Tanist amongst his dependents. He was Judge, Jury, and Executive in all their disputes. At Darrynane he held, during his stay, a permanent "Arbitration Court," and like the Court of law in England in former days, his Court moved about wherever he went. Often, on the top of a mountain crag, while the hounds were at fault, would he sit on one of nature's rude imperishable benches, to hear and determine the disputes. In his native fastnesses, he did not require the Royal commission of England. His word was law: and no passive resistance was offered to his fiat. He was a thorough Irishman in all his characteristics—even in his foibles. He was prouder of being the possessor of an estate called Glencara, in the Barony of Iveragh, which was in the family time out of mind, than of many of his personal triumphs. How like an Irishman of Kerry extraction! He was proud of his ancient pedigree; and speaking of it, he used to say—"That the antiquity of his race was well authenticated, "not only by tradition, but by their immemorial possession "of the land of Glencara. As to the written pedigree," he would add, "I consider it spoiled by the Chevalier "O'GORMAN, who, without sufficient data, undertook to "draw it up."

His mountain sports never turned him from his absorbing pursuit of POLITICS. He was in the habit of proceeding on his hunting expeditions early in the morning and on foot; wearing thick *brogues*, and bearing a substantial *wattle* in his hand. Breakfast was taken out, and at the usual hour, at some convenient spot, it was laid out *al fresco*. Then the post-boy arrived with letters and newspapers. No editor ever had so many at his command, or ever read them with more attention.—They were a part of O'CONNELL'S existence. He could not live without them; more particularly, if they abused

him. These he read with the greatest *gout*; and so absorbed was he in their perusal, that he became quite unconscious of the persons who happened to be about him. The caricatures of H. B.'s pencil also came to him, and he preserved them. The post-boy deposited the contents of his bag on the ground, while the LIBERATOR breakfasted. His appetite, always good, freshened by the mountain air, did great justice to his excellent house-keeper's provender. In the meantime letters were opened and thrown down. Newspapers were read and flung aside; and when the repast was over, the huntsman's horn was sounded, and the fine pack of beagles summoned to their day's work. At Darrynane there was princely hospitality without ostentation. There was no gorgeous service on the table; nor did a SOYER preside at the *cuisine*; nor did the vintage of Burgundy circulate generally. But there was every thing that became a gentleman's table, living on his own estates. To O'CONNELL'S table all were welcome. Hospitality was a kind of heir-loom at Darrynane. No one was denied whatever it afforded. It was already become the resort of the tourist; and many a man of different politics, and without even an introduction, spent days, nay, sometimes weeks, under the hospitable roof. One singular instance of this is related by a witness. Though we have afforded examples before, we cannot avoid giving the following. Late in the evening, word was sent up that a gentleman—a stranger, without any introduction, was at the door; and being away from any house of entertainment, took the liberty of invoking the hospitality of Darrynane. He was an Englishman. That was a sufficient introduction. He was introduced to the Drawing-room. The ladies of the family expected to see some interesting stranger, more particularly as he turned out to be a

geologist, engaged in examining the strata of the Iveragh hills. He turned out a bore. No one knew who he was —no one spoke to him ; still he continued at the house, to the great annoyance of the younger branches of the family, who were not only *ennuyed*, but restrained by his presence ; for he did not participate in their evening's amusements, nor enter into conversation. During the day, while the male portion of the visitors were enjoying the sports of the field, this singular stranger spent his hours alone amongst the rocks, hammer in hand. Day after day he remained ; and there was no likelihood of his departure. Hints were given by those who were wearied of his presence, but not taken ; the Geologist was imperturbable. At last, at the end of three weeks, this strange being was met by an equestrian party of the ladies and gentlemen of Darrynane, on their way home to dinner. He was astride a mountain pony, and a boy was running alongside, with a port-manteau. They passed him, saluted him, and he never was heard of since. No one knew who he was, and he never told his residence or history. He was a stranger That was sufficient for the LIBERATOR ; who, except during dinner, and an hour after, and again for an hour in the drawing room, passed little time in the society of the many visitors who flocked to the Abbey. He was perpetually in his study, with his amanuensis, either writing, or dictating, or studying. Such was, with occasional exceptions, when a friend arrived, his invariable practice.

Every gentleman was welcome at Darrynane ; for it was, in the true Irish sense of the word, an " open house." It can be easily supposed, O'CONNELL had a very large number of relatives ; when it is recollected he had twenty-one uncles and aunts, and seven married sisters.

They looked up to him as to a patriarch, and always assembled round him when he returned to Kerry. He was attached to his relatives, and always glad to have them with him. Every day during his sojourn in the country, the table was laid for at least thirty guests; the greater number of whom were his relatives, and nearly connected to each other. It is easy to understand the affectionate, friendly, happy intercourse that existed amongst such a circle. The LIBERATOR had a word of kindness for them all, and would occasionally raise the gay laugh amongst them, by a sally at the expense of some amongst the group. Mrs. O'CONNELL, too, was attached to his relatives, and thus happiness reigned at Darrynane.—Subsequently to her death, O'CONNELL's daughters presided during his stay at the Abbey—and made its society delightful and attractive by their affability and attention. It was pleasing to observe the respect paid the LIBERATOR, as he was invariably addressed in his own house. He was treated by all not only as a father, but like a monarch; and when he was poring over the papers, all would sit in silence until he had concluded. No Sovereign was ever so revered and idolized.

From this mountain home, he sent out, week after week, spirit-moving letters to the Irish people; calling on them to register under the New Act, and showing how they should proceed. Three years afterwards, PEEL taught, in England, the doctrine that the battle of the constitution was to be fought in the Registration Courts. O'CONNELL anticipated him, in Ireland; and, had he the same franchises to wield, he would have made good work of it. But, as it was, he was triumphant at the general elections.

One of the most remarkable of his letters from Darrynane this year, was one in which he developed his plan of

Glebes and Manse-houses for "The Clergy of the People." It was addressed to the *Repealer*, a Dublin newspaper then, in existence; by which exception was taken to the payment, in any form, of the Catholic priesthood.—O'CONNELL replied:—

"My plan does not include, directly or indirectly, any government provision—that is, any provision over which the government would have any species of control.—My plan does not embrace any provision which the government would have the power to bestow, or to take away. My plan does not connect the clergy, directly or indirectly, with the state, any more than every landholder is connected with the state under which he lives—a connexion of mere protection, like that of every other subject in the land.

"Above all, my plan does not contain one single ingredient, by means of which the Government could, in any manner, influence the conduct of the clergy; neither does it include anything to induce the clergy to neglect their duty to the people, to religion, or to morality.

"I defy all the world to point out any part of my plan that is, in the slightest degree, inconsistent with the description I gave of it. If any attempt had been made to specify its defects, I should have been prepared to reply; but as only general declamation is used about Government influence, and popular desertion, it ought to be quite sufficient for me to meet the charges with a positive and unequivocal denial."

He then went on to support his plan by arguments calculated to gain converts, and produce conviction.

The next remarkable letter which he wrote from Darrynane, was addressed to the Political Union, in Ireland.—It was an impeachment of ANGLESEY, STANLEY, and BLACKBURNE, for their conduct during the Tithe warfare, and it concluded with this solemn declaration:—

“First—“ He said, ” I AM DETERMINED NEVER AGAIN VOLUNTARILY TO PAY TITHES. Second—I AM DETERMINED NEVER AGAIN VOLUNTARILY TO PAY VESTRY CESS. Third—I AM DETERMINED NEVER TO BUY ONE SINGLE ARTICLE SOLD FOR TITHES OR VESTRY CESS. Such are my three individual resolutions ; let every other man act as he pleases. I have made up my mind to this course. I will not oppose the law ; let it take its course ; but I decline paying to, or buying from, tithe proctors.”

Declaring what his own intentions were, without advising others, was no violation of the law.

The next letter was to the Electors of the County of Limerick, who had invited him to stand as the Candidate for their representation. The text of this letter was, that CHARITY IS THE GREATEST VIRTUE ; and enlarging on this theme, he called upon the electors to forgive, forget, and to unite for the good of their common country. He, however, declined the proffered honor.

The numerous letters which issued this year from his prolific pen, are all full of his characteristics as a political writer—great clearness and force. Two other letters only require especial notice ; one was, the celebrated address directed to the *Sun* newspaper, which no liberal Irish journal dared to publish, though the law of libel was the same in both countries. But trial by jury was different.—The *Evening Mail*, however, printed the letter, and challenged the Government to prosecute. The *Pilot* would have done so likewise, but was restrained by O'CONNELL'S advice. It was a powerful unsparing attack on the Irish Government. The next of the letters we allude to, caused much discussion ; for it insisted on pledges at the approaching election. It is now needless to enumerate these pledges. No more is necessary to say, than to advocate and support the REPEAL OF THE UNION, was the important one. It is the fashion to condemn the tak-

ing of any pledge, by a member of Parliament, as inconsistent with his independence in his representative capacity. He is not a delegate from a particular body, sent for a particular measure, and no more; he represents the whole community though elected by a locality. Taking a pledge, it is said, binds a man not to alter his opinions with changing circumstances; or, if he does, renders him liable to the charge of dishonour. Witness the unsparing abuse the pledged Corn Law supporters received, for deserting the principles which obtained their seats in Parliament. We confess we cannot see the force of this reasoning. No person can be a true representative of a constituency, unless he represents their sentiments on great national questions. It would be exceedingly inconsistent for a Repeal constituency to return a non-repealer; if they deem the question of great national importance, they are justified in marking their opinion by demanding a solemn pledge. Undoubtedly, without such formality, we hold that a person seeking the honor of representing, in Parliament, men whose sentiments are well known, is honorably bound to support their views in the House of Commons, and, if he will not, to resign. The pledge, however, gives greater importance and solemnity to the engagement. On such a question, then, as the Repeal of the Union—if the people are in favor of it, they are right in insisting on a pledge; and the man who, from honest conviction, takes it, is no delegate—but thoroughly independent, and simply bound to carry out his own views. On the Repeal question, these pledges are the more necessary, as it is only by a combined and unshrinking band of Repealers in Parliament, that the measure can be ever carried. Return to the House of Commons a sufficient number of Irish members, sure, from their united strength, of being listened to; showing that they represent the great majority of the constituencies, and pledged to use every

effort to carry an object deemed of most vital importance to Ireland ; then will there be a hope of accomplishing what is so ardently desiderated ; then will there be an improved prospect of winning legislative independence. The system of pledges, then, on great political questions, we think quite justifiable, and quite consistent with the independence of the Representative. In that respect, Mr. O'CONNELL's advice, which was so much condemned at the time by the English Press, met the approbation of the Irish people ; and at the elections was acted on with vigor. It is true, that in some cases, it caused a severance from the popular side of excellent men, who, though good and sincere patriots and useful members, were thrown over for less worthy substitutes ; but the national principle was thereby advanced—though at the expense of individual interests. These were the exceptions. The general result was favourable to the people's cause.

When O'CONNELL quitted his retreat at Darrynane, he became at once involved, as counsel, in the Tithe trials. The first tithe conviction was at the Tralee Assizes in a case in which he was engaged. He then proceeded to Cork, where several most interesting trials, connected with the tithe agitation, were decided. He was late for Mr. HODNETT's trial, though he was expected ; having been retained special in a case which was settled early in the Assizes. HODNETT was convicted. There was, however, another trial pending, in which HODNETT was plaintiff ; and General Sir GEORGE BINGHAM, defendant. It was an action for an assault.—O'CONNELL was leading Counsel for the Plaintiff. General BINGHAM, during the Tithe campaign, was riding with a party of lancers, on the road leading to Whitechurch, near Cork. He was hunting tithe "rebels."—He came up to HODNETT, who, with another, was walking peaceably on the road, to visit the Rev. MATHEW

HORGAN'S well-known Round Tower, at Whitechurch. Sir GEORGE BINGHAM, addressing HODNETT, asked where "his Drum-Major's cap and paraphernalia were"—alluding to the dress he wore at the Cork tithe sale, when he rode in at the head of the anti-tithe cavalry.—He then turned round to the Lancers, and cried, "there, is the head of the rebels; cut him down—ride him down;" thereupon the troops formed round HODNETT, and drove him into the dyke. For this the action was brought. In the whole course of his professional career, no effort of O'CONNELL'S, with the single exception of his great speech in MAGEE'S case, surpassed his two speeches on this occasion; particularly his closing speech to the Jury, in reply. This was a master-piece; and will be long recollected in Cork, from the sensation it then produced.—The writer was present, and has a most vivid recollection of the entrancing nature of that address. Sir GEORGE BINGHAM was found GUILTY. He was a man of very sensitive feelings; and this verdict made so strong an impression on his mind, that he very soon after died. There were several Tithe prosecutions at this Cork Assizes; and many of the persons indicted belonged to the better classes. One very distinguished patriot, and a highly honourable gentleman, was amongst the number who were to be tried; because he presided at a tithe meeting. Before the Assizes, however, this respected gentleman died. It was said his death was caused by annoyance, at being arrested on such a charge. O'CONNELL was engaged in all the cases that came on for trial after his arrival in Cork. During the long sittings in Court—his usual mirth and ready wit never failed him; and he kept the bar and the listening by-standers in constant hilarity. He made an excellent hit during Sir GEORGE BINGHAM'S trial. The General's

Aide-de-Camp, Captain BERNERS, of the Royal Artillery, was under examination. A junior Counsel asked the witness "what is the meaning of the military phrase, ride "him down?" "Do you think," interposed O'CONNELL, "we are here to get an explanation of plain English from "an English *Aide-de-Camp*, with his tongue in holiday "dress?" then turning to the witness, he said, "you belong to the Artillery and understand Horse language"—"Yes." Mr. Justice MOORE, who tried the case, here observed—"I ought to understand it, Mr. O'CONNELL; for I was a long while Captain of cavalry." "Yes, you were, my Lord," replied O'CONNELL, "and I recollect you a long time a *Sergeant* too." This ready sally, caused a burst of laughter throughout the whole court. On another occasion, a person was tried for posting a notice for a Tithe meeting. It was of a very inflammatory nature. It invited all enemies of Tithes to be early in attendance; and as it was the production of some village schoolmaster, it terminated with the Latin quotation, very appropriate if it were understood—*sero venientibus ossa*. Mr. GEORGE BENNETT, the Crown Counsel, translated it thus for the Jury—"The bones of those who come late shall lie." Mr. O'CONNELL at once took him up—crying out "Oh! GEORGE, I declare if a petit jury "in Kerry heard you give such a translation, they "would die of laughter. No, no, Gentlemen of the "Jury, it means—He who comes late shall get nothing "but the bones—NO MEAT." Such was at all times his readiness and tact.

O'CONNELL returned in November to Dublin. He had previously declined the invitation to stand for Dublin, with Mr. RUTHVEN. He preferred just then remaining member for Kerry. On his arrival, the National Political Union soon became an attraction, from an anxiety to hear the LIBERATOR. His popularity was unbounded.

Crowds followed him in the streets. It was an escort other men would like to escape. But O'CONNELL was fond of that kind of thing. The affectionate blessings of the people he liked always to receive. Towards the end of November, he made a very brilliant speech at the National Union. We cannot deny ourselves the gratification of extracting from it one eloquent passage :—

“ Oh, let us for a minute contemplate the scene on the day when we shall turn out the money changers from that beautiful edifice, in which our Parliament sat before, and in which it will sit again ; that day when the streets will be crowded with free Irishmen, whose shouts for liberty will rend the air ; when every window will produce a galaxy of native loveliness ; and when the noble and high-spirited youth of Ireland, will stand in the streets of our beautiful city, shouting liberty, independence, peace, and tranquillity for Ireland—(Loud cheers)—and when the Speaker of the House of Commons shall again take his seat, I will claim the privilege (perhaps it may be vanity) of moving the address—(Tremendous cheering). I have indulged in the anticipation of this glorious day, while gazing upon the vast Atlantic. For I love the wild beauties of nature ; and I have but just come from my native mountains, where I walked abroad, amid the most magnificent scenery in the world ; and where I listened to the voice of nature, as if speaking to eternity, in the mighty waves which broke innocuously against the iron bound cliffs of my native shore. There I heard the mountain-stream, as if whispering, in a still soft voice, “ Now is the time to strain every nerve for Ireland's regeneration, when her sons have forgot the bad passions which so long kept them enslaved, by setting them against each other. Seven hundred years have now rolled on, since the first hostile foot of the Saxon and the stranger polluted your lovely soil ; but the time is come when the

sons of Ireland, in peaceable but irresistible strength, bound together by chains of love, become in their union too strong for bondage, and walk abroad in the full enjoyment of liberty" (Long continued cheering). I want no triumph; I only wish that all Irishmen should be bound in a link of brotherly love; and that once accomplished, I anticipate a higher delight—when, in the words of the poet, I can say—

' Look through nature—through the range
Of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres,
Whirling unshaken through the void immense,
And speak, O man, can this capacious scene
With half that kindling majesty dilate
My strong conception, as when Brutus rose
Amidst the crowd of patriots—and his arm upflung,
Like immortal Jove, when guilt brings down the thunder,
Called on Tully's name, and bad the father of his country hail '

I quit Rome and return to my native land; for lo, the Union's prostrate in the dust, and Ireland again is free."

Early in September, a motion was proposed by Mr. WILLIAM SCOTT, in the Dublin Corporation for a Repeal of the Union. The proposition was strongly supported. However, on some pretext or other, the assembly adjourned, and nothing after occurred there on the subject. The Guild of St. Hov, or corporation of Smiths, afterwards waited on this gentleman with an address for his conduct on that occasion. It was after O'CONNELL'S arrival in Dublin. There was an effort at that time made to get a Repeal Corporator to start with RUTHVEN. This circumstance suggested the idea of making the occasion of presenting this address, a gala day. O'CONNELL was almost *the party at the dejeune*. The "glorious, pious, and immortal memory" was drunk amidst loud applause, in which O'CONNELL heartily joined. "I have never," he said "drunk this toast in my life, but I am not now too

old to begin." He then called for the amalgamation of all parties in the coming contest for nationality.

Amongst the many persons who were now named as Candidates for Parliamentary honors, under the Reform *regime*, THOMAS MOORE, our National Poet, was one. The city of Limerick was desirous of having him as their Representative. They even proposed to purchase for him the necessary qualification. But the Poet declined standing. In reference to this, we must again quote the LIBERATOR. Speaking at the Political Union, of the cause of Mr. MOORE's declining to enter Parliament, he said :

“ The sentiment is becoming of him, who is equally great in his writings as he is delightful in private life—never yet was music so well wedded to immortal verse as by him. I attribute much of the present state of feeling, and the desire for liberty in Ireland, to the works of that illustrious man—he has brought patriotism into the private circles of domestic life, and where there is the sweetest melody of the finest voice to enchain the attention of the hearer, its effect is aided by the songs, charming and thrilling with the melancholy and delicious music of the people of Ireland—those songs with which the Irish consoled themselves in their misfortunes, and which, even in their most mirthful tones, have a strain of sadness for the fate of the country. MOORE has made patriotism an article of the toilet ; the wrongs of Ireland are felt by the young female heart, and man does not dare to exclaim against patriotism, when it comes recommended by those upon whom his destinies depend—and never does patriotism appear so charming, as when it is animating the gentle bosom of woman. MOORE has excited a sympathy for us even amongst the enemies of Ireland, who, as they listen to the words of the bard cannot help sighing over the song of the captive. Besides, his animating

strains lead to higher and nobler thoughts than these; for though it is only the imagination of the poet, yet who does not feel his spirit rise, and his feelings become buoyant as he repeats these lines—

We tread the land that bore us ;
 The green flag glitters o'er us ;
 The friends we've tried
 Are by our side,
 And the foe we hate before us !

MOORE has rendered it impossible that the country which is animated by his patriotic music should continue long enslaved. He conveys his ardent feelings in favour of Ireland, with all the strength and rapidity of electricity—he has made liberty a passion, and poetry and patriotism are combined by him amongst the domestic enjoyments.”

On the First of December, there was a crowded meeting of the Political Union. At this meeting, SHEIL declared his adhesion to Repeal, amidst loud shouting. The following passage is extracted, because of its declarations and its eloquence; but the whole speech should be perused by any one anxious to read a conclusive argument for Repeal, clothed in the most fervid, impassioned, and soul-stirring language.

“ The place I staid in,” said Mr. SHEIL, “ is encompassed with recollections. It was from hence that, year after year, we sent forth those appeals to the pride, to the nationality, to the just sense, to the reason of the Irish people, by which Emancipation (the word has become familiar, though it never can be vulgar; but etymology is pregnant with noble thought) was accomplished. I took some part in those great proceedings—(cheers). I felt profoundly, and I spoke with ardour; and turning my emotions into words, I communicated to others the sentiments by which I was ardently affected. My share in that vast achievement was

considerable; but it was not destitute of honour. I was appreciated by my fellow-bondsmen beyond my deserts. From almost every district in this great country, (for this country has become great) I received large testimonies of national approbation. It is impossible for me, on entering this spot, not to recal to my recollection some scenes of that noble drama in which I enacted a part, not altogether inferior; and now that I enter this stage again, I must be forgiven, if I indulge in what would be egotism, if others did not feel that they participated in these recollections. You will not blame me, I am sure you will not, if, while I survey these localities which are consecrated to the freedom of Ireland, I venture to pour out my thoughts before you, and to say that it is not without some pride, that I behold the field in which a victory for Ireland, which was only the precursor of another, was obtained (Hear, hear). We stand on the same ground—the same flags are unfurled, and as we advance to the encounter, our trust in our success is confirmed by the remembrance of our former triumph. “This is the sun of Austerlitz,” exclaimed NAPOLEON, when he saw the glorious luminary arise on the plain of Jena. Let us remember, in order that we may hope. I have referred to my recollection for no other purpose than to open my anticipation. Emancipation was carried here; and here, if the same policy be pursued with respect to Ireland, shall Repeal be accomplished.—To what a magnitude it has dilated—to what a vast stature has this question arisen. A few months have been sufficient for its rapid and gigantic growth. O’CONNELL on one side of the cradle, and STANLEY at the other, have rocked this offspring of the wrongs of Ireland, and cradled it into strength; the one by appealing to the instincts of the nation, the other by offering

outrage to its pride; the one by applying all the stimulants which could be used with its generous feelings, the other by a series of the most exasperating offences that could have been devised, have, without any communication of purpose, but by impulses in an opposite direction, excited a feeling, of which, at the approaching elections, a most formidable demonstration will be afforded. Night after night in Parliament, day after day out of Parliament, we told the Minister and his auxiliaries, "You will drive the people of Ireland into fury; you will, by your impolitic measures, awake a sentiment which it will be impossible to subdue; the election is at hand—new power is to be given to the people—is it not a kind of phrensy, at the very instant that you are furnishing them with new strength, to administer to them a new provocation." This, or something like this, was said; it was said, not only in the House of Commons, but in those assemblages of the Irish members, in which they were occasionally called together, in order to give their opinions, and to learn in what little account they were held by the Government. "Pause for God's sake," I often exclaimed—"think what you are about to do; you know little of the interest, still less of the feelings of the Irish people; you will at the hustings to be raised under your own reform bill, feel the results of all those injuries and of all those affronts which you are offering to Ireland." Was I right? Look to the state of Ireland; see what has befallen it. A call, irresistible to those who are dependent on the people, has been made—we are all sucked into the vast vortex—"the Repeal" is demanded in every borough, and in every county—it is used as the touchstone of honesty, and the test of political faith—and so far from being surprised that this should be the case, I should be astonished that it were otherwise."

On the third of December, the old Parliament was dissolved ; and a new one, under the Reform Franchises, summoned.

O'CONNELL with RUTHVEN was returned for Dublin, and his son-in-law, CHARLES O'CONNELL, of Bahoss, was returned, in the LIBERATOR'S place, for the County of Kerry.

The cause of Repeal and of Reform triumphed beyond measure at this first election under the Reform Act.

O'CONNELL had repeatedly declined standing for the Irish Metropolis, thinking that a Corporate Repealer would be surer to win the seat ; and his brother, JOHN O'CONNELL, of Grena, published a letter in the papers, stating that he would positively stand again for his native County. With that intention, he left Dublin, and proceeded to Kerry. However, in his absence, it was discovered that, as in the case of the Clare election, none but he could beat the Tories in the Capital ; and letters were dispatched to Tralee, and reached it on the eve of the election there. He had no alternative but to stand for Dublin, and look, at the eleventh hour, for a Candidate for Kerry in his place. This was a difficulty. He wished himself that JOHN SHEA LAWLOR, a gentleman of very distinguished talents, should stand, and he offered to subscribe £300 towards his election. The result, however, was, that CHARLES O'CONNELL, of Bahoss, was selected as the Candidate.

We cannot close the history of 1832, without noticing one of the most memorable events which occurred that year—though O'CONNELL did not directly take a part in it. We allude to the Marquess of ANGLESEY'S celebrated visit to Cork. It was then he complained so bitterly of the cold reception he met with from the people. No description could exaggerate the sullen humour of

the populace. It was painful even to those who condemned the ill-advised policy of the Viceroy. It was on this occasion he spoke of four-gun brigs being sufficient to defeat the projects of "Separation" contemplated by Repealers. A memorial was presented to his Excellency, on the state of the manufactures, and calling for encouragement; and the establishment of Irish manufactures was one of the favorite projects of the day. Dr. BALDWIN, afterwards representative for the City of Cork, and a gentleman of known talents, headed the deputation. His Excellency discussed, *viva voce*, in an off-hand manner, the address, paragraph by paragraph. A report is preserved of this singular interview, and from it we extract a few passages. Speaking of the want of capital in Ireland, applicable to manufactures, His EXCELLENCY said:—

"It is the continual excitement and unceasing agitation which pervade the country, that prevent the influx of English Capital, since the passing of the Relief Bill; and the promotion of Irish Manufactures, which would be the natural consequence. No wealthy Capitalist who loved ease and quiet would venture to embark his capital in the country in its present disturbed state, even with the prospect of employing it to the greatest advantage. It is for this reason that Ireland is at present as we find her."

"Doctor BALDWIN, in reply, observed that we had many intervals of quiet since the Union, from which we derived little advantage; that the subject of Catholic Emancipation was not even mooted till 1805, and that if English Capital were to be introduced at all, or English Legislation improved, there was abundant time from the Union to that period; that we had times of war, and of peace, of civil agitation decided and quiet, in either of

which we did not find the condition of the country ameliorated by either Legislation or Capital. From agitation alone, we derived whatever benefits had been extended to our country.

“The Noble MARQUESS, after perusing the Memorial again, said—The present Government is the most liberal which we have known for a long series of years. It honestly and truly professes to legislate for the improvement of Ireland; but the collision of angry parties renders the measures in contemplation of Government, difficult of application; and the whole energies of the contending factions seem devoted to procrastinate any wholesome measure of relief, and to obstruct the good intentions entertained towards the country. For myself, I am suffering martyrdom between the parties. In 1828, I was the most popular man in Ireland, and I will take to myself the credit of having been the immediate cause of procuring Catholic Emancipation. For my acts in the Government at that period, I lost the confidence of the Ministers of England; I was deprived of my office—and what I valued far higher than any other consideration, I lost the friendship and regard of the KING. All this I suffered for Ireland and for her welfare, and, I must say, I met with a most ungrateful return. At the time I refer to, I was the most popular man in Ireland; and now, by the machinations of agitators and leaders, and the misrepresentations of interested parties, I am the most unpopular man.” (As his Excellency spoke the last sentence, he turned round to the Military Gentlemen present, as if appealing to them upon the justness of his remark, and they appeared to indicate assent. His Excellency then continued)—“And I appeal to every body about me, whether I have not been treated with marked disrespect? But I acquit the People of the charge of ingratitude, laying it more strongly upon the shoulders of their lead-

ers ; for I do believe that if great pains had not been taken with them, ninety nine out of every hundred would have cheered me as I passed through the country,— For myself it does not signify. Nobody is more aware than I am, how hard a task it is to administer the laws in Ireland. Convinced, however, as I am, of the integrity of intention, and the liberal plans of his Majesty's present honest Ministers, towards this Country, and knowing from my own experience the difficulty of applying these views and legislating upon them; viewing, moreover, the administration of the Government impeded and embarrassed by the contentions of opposing parties, I have subdued my anxiety to retire from public life, and shall not desert the post because it is one of difficulty, if not of danger."

Dr. BALDWIN, in reply, complimented his Excellency upon his daring and high-mindedness,—his gallantry in facing danger,—and his exalted character both as a Statesman and a Soldier.

" His EXCELLENCY then, with much earnestness, and in a tone indicating firmness of purpose and undoubting confidence, said—" a day will shortly arrive,—it can't be distant,—indeed it is not possible it can be distant,—when measures already prepared, and in preparation, for the Government of Ireland, will be developed; and when justice will be done to the Government of the country for its good intentions. When that day comes—and come it shortly will—I shall expect to receive from you, a letter of acknowledgment upon the subject, and of thanks for what is now in progress of legislative preparation, and for my individual exertions in contributing to create an order of things suited for those measures. I necessarily found myself at variance with two parties which are struggling for their own private and factious ends—retarding improvement—injuring the country—and obstructing the mea-

tures of the Government. One of those parties I have put down, and you want to mount and bestride them; but that shall not be; for I will master you both! And with respect to the Repeal of the Union (continued his Excellency, turning short from the subject upon which he had been speaking), to enable any impartial man to decide upon the advantage of such a measure, I would only ask him to visit the quays of Dublin, and I would there enquire of him, what would become of the trade of the country if severed from England? What (tauntingly) of your pigs, your corn, and your butter? Why, I would but ask my friend, Sir P. MALCOLM, and four gun brigs, to blockade every river in your country." His Excellency, after using this expression, turned round, and appealed to the gallant Admiral, who bowed his concurrence.

"The DEPUTATION admitted the great naval and military power of England; but, in seeking for a Repeal of the Legislative Union, the people of Ireland never contemplated for a moment a separation between the countries, or, consequently, a war with England. On the contrary, it had invariably been the study of the leaders of the people who advocate Repeal, distinctly to prohibit them from entertaining any thoughts or opinions in the least tending to such a separation. But, if it should so happen, that Sir PULTENEY MALCOLM and his four gun brigs, did blockade our ports, we have little apprehension that we have ample sources within ourselves for our prosperity. The revenue raised from Ireland, and expended in England and the Colonies, was, we conceive, the great source of national complaint—tending, as it did, to the impoverishment of the country, and to the diminution of the people's prosperity.

"The NOBLE MARQUESS observed that the argument

used by the Deputation, might perhaps be employed with more propriety in Parliament, than upon the present occasion.

“ A military gentleman here remarked, that as Doctor BALDWIN was a candidate for the representation of Cork, it would be, perhaps, well if he reserved his observations for his place in the House of Commons.

“ DR. BALDWIN.—I do expect, Sir, to have the honour of representing my native City in Parliament; but the observations which I made were not unsolicited; I did not urge them of myself; they were in reply to questions put to me by his Excellency, and I was induced to make them by his urbanity.

“ Some of the attending Officers having here alluded to the lateness of the hour.

“ The MARQUESS rose, as if about to conclude the conference, and the Deputation were, in consequence, preparing to depart, when His Excellency said—“ I am not, you perceive, doing things according to form. Here I am, talking to you in a manner which etiquette and ceremonial would not admit; but I wish to speak with you in a friendly way, and to impress on your minds that the courses pursued at public meetings, and those angry collisions with the Government, which many are so prone to cultivate and encourage, militate against the very objects and ends which are sought to be accomplished.

“ After some desultory observations had been made.

“ His EXCELLENCY again took up the Memorial, and, addressing the Deputation, said,—“ you call upon me for an inquiry into the circumstances of the military interference at the Blarney meeting.

“ DR. BALDWIN.—Yes; that is our object. We conceive that that interference was illegal and unconstitutional; but we do not mean to charge the military with

having dispersed the meeting, but at the desire and by the instructions of Sir WILLIAM GOSSETT, or the Magistrates.

“ At the mention of the name of Sir WILLIAM GOSSETT, the Noble Marquess appeared exceedingly indignant, angrily exclaiming—“ There is no such person as Sir WILLIAM GOSSET—I am Sir WILLIAM GOSSETT ; he is my Private Secretary ; I adopt his acts, and I will answer for them. You call for an inquiry ; if you wish it shall be granted you. The Government has never refused to direct an inquiry when any sufficient grounds have been alleged for its institution. Though I am satisfied that this will have the same termination as most other proceedings of a similar kind, I will grant it if you wish. I have always selected for such inquiries men of the most honorable character, and from the most liberal class of the profession ; and I have yet found that they invariably terminated in the exculpation of the accused party.

“ Towards the close of the conference, it was stated by one of the Deputation, that a man had been lanced by a cavalry soldier, in a field belonging to Mr. JEFFERIES, on the day of the Biarney Meeting.

“ Sir GEORGE BINGHAM declared that that was the first intimation he had received of any such occurrence having taken place ; he stated that he had been requested by Mr. JEFFERIES to clear a particular field of the populace who had been thronging into it ; and he had, accordingly, given orders that it should be done ; but he positively affirmed that he had not until then heard of the charge which had been put forward.

“ One of the Deputation assured his Excellency that he was an eye-witness to the transaction.

“ HIS EXCELLENCY—If you can name a single military man who has done wrong, you shall have the most satisfac-

tory inquiry into his conduct. Can you name the man?— You shall have the Attorney-General, and the best assistance the Government can supply, for his prosecution.

“ To this it was replied, that the individual could not be identified; his Excellency could only be assured of the fact.

“ The conference, which lasted for over an hour, here concluded, and the Deputation retired.

“ Although the opinions and sentiments expressed in this interview by his Excellency, were not in concurrence with those of the Deputation, they could not depart without strong feelings of respect for the character and independence of his Excellency, and for that benignity of manner which so happily and quickly succeeded every indication of displeasure,”

The interview certainly tended to sustain the high character for frankness and honor of the Noble Marquess, however little expressions he let fall advanced his popularity; for the changes were rung by O'CONNELL on the “ four gun brigs,” in a manner no less mortifying to the Viceroy, than it was damaging to his claims on public estimation. In consequence of his promise—Mr. O'LOUGHLIN was sent to hold an inquiry on the occurrences at the Blarney meeting, which was dispersed by the military. This memorable transaction took place in August—but, not to break through the narrative of O'CONNELL'S career, we must proceed.

In the elections of 1832, the cause of REPEAL triumphed beyond all expectation. It is difficult to convey to those who were not then participators in the struggle, any but a very imperfect notion of the enthusiasm which pervaded the whole of the three provinces. The people's hearts were in the cause and contest. Their pride, their traditions—their own reminiscences, and their present condition, combined to inspire them with high hopes for their coun-

try, through this agitation, if vigorously prosecuted. They saw their country wasting away, year after year—her proprietary absentees—the produce of their own labour wafted from their shores, to pamper the rich and luxurious, or to supply the wants of the industrious, in another country. They lived, and their fathers lived, and their children were likely still to live, from hand to mouth; periodically starving, and at best, feeding on a root too often scarcely fit to fatten swine. They saw, knew and felt their condition and privations keenly. High intellectual culture or literary leisure, was not necessary to the knowledge of such patent facts, or the deduction of the conclusions to which they came. They who ran could read. Tradition told the illiterate, and history informed the educated, that when Ireland had her own independent Parliament, she advanced more rapidly than any nation whose career was known, in prosperity and glory. These facts and reminiscences made the Irish people, from their boyhood, Repealers. It is an error to suppose, that when their enthusiasm was boiling over, they were more Repealers than when lassitude or apathy affected them. It is an error to suppose they became Repealers, only because O'CONNELL showed them what they suffered, and pointed out the remedy. Though the courage of the lion may be sometimes inactive, the characteristic instinct abides with him as much when he slumbers, as when he is aroused. The red Indian has his traditions, as the European has his history; and he knows the origin and early progress of his degradation, the cause of his ruin—the comforts he has lost—the privations he endures—and the chances or means of reparation—as well as COOPER, or any other historian who has described the wild warrior's battles, sufferings and wrongs. Even so with the Irish people;—their apathy, as with all nations, is periodical; but the instinctive love of national independence, is their charac-

teristic ; it is engrafted in their nature, and will abide with them for ever. In moments of familiar intercourse, Mr. O'CONNELL often said to the writer, when he was deploring, in years subsequent to 1833—the prevailing indifference—when the writer used lament to him this state of apathetic coldness—“ Don't mind,” he would reply, “ don't mind—the fire but smoulders ; the sentiment of “ nationality is the very instinct of the People. It burns “ within them. It sustains them in their misery. It can “ never be extinguished. Sooner or later it will burst out “ again. A spark will do it.” A spark did do it ; for, in ten days after O'CONNELL's Corporation debate, in 1843, the flame of Repeal spread again far and wide, like fire through parched grass, throughout the country. The most ignorant of the peasantry knew from tradition, and O'CONNELL's teachings, that when Ireland had a Parliament she was prosperous ;—that when she lost it, she was poverty-stricken ; and that when she agitated for religious rights, she succeeded. They had an inward consciousness that a similar agitation would give them back national prosperity. O'CONNELL simply showed them how it was to be achieved. Without his instructions, they may have been induced to do as they did in 1798, attempt to realize their cherished hopes by physical force. There can be no doubt about it ; they were willing to try any chance, and adopt any course, to obtain the independence for which they sighed. The glory of O'CONNELL is, that he has implanted in their minds the conviction, that perseverance in constitutional agitation, will achieve every thing ; while physical force will, as surely, eventuate in ruin. But it is a mistake to assert that they would never think of nationality only for his agitation, or that they would live on contentedly, in filth and poverty, but

for the self-reliance with which he inspired them.—The highest and noblest sentiment of the mind is religion. The Irish nation has ever cordially cherished that sentiment, but the greater their ardour, the more they were oppressed. While, then, they observed the ascendancy of another religion—and that the religion of a small minority; while they saw it upheld by the English connexion, they felt that if there was no other reason, this was sufficient to make national independence an indispensable acquisition. Here again O'CONNELL came to their instruction, and while he gloried in the religious feeling of the people, he taught them that religious intolerance was not their policy in the achievement of their rights. He endeavoured, during his long life, to establish a national brotherhood. He preached on the text “love one another.” This lesson came from one of themselves; a sincere, pious, practical Catholic. From any other religionist it would not be listened to; for religious antagonism was the condition in which they and their forefathers lived. O'CONNELL taught them the value of union—the danger of physical force, and the efficacy of moral agitation, in obtaining redress of political wrongs, or the amelioration of social evils. He placed safer weapons in their hands, to fight their own national battles. But he had no occasion to tell them the object for which that battle was to be fought. They knew that purpose themselves. A great portion of O'CONNELL'S life was devoted to restraining the people, and directing them in the right course. He had no occasion to urge them on.—To get rid of grievances, it never was necessary to goad them on. Who, for instance, abolished the tithe system? The people, by their conduct, first in 1822, next in 1832. It is a blunder to affirm that O'CONNELL created the desire for the Repeal of the union.—He merely brought it into action. He used, himself, often to say, that “he was like

“a straw floating on the surface of the deep stream, which showed how the current ran.” Even the farmers who were told that without England to purchase their produce, there would be no prices—even they, spurning the narrow selfishness of this argument, were, are, and will continue to be Repealers, until they accomplish the object of their hopes. They may, and will occasionally slumber; but in the main, they will labour on, with O'CONNELL's life as their manual, until what they desire is fully and finally accomplished.

In the elections of 1832, we have said, the national sentiment had lighted up into intense enthusiasm. The writer was a witness of the public feeling, and an actor in some of the scenes. The people did not care a straw for persons. Whoever would vote for Repeal, he was their man, and they cared for nothing more. The women were as enthusiastic as the men, and would listen to no compromise—no promptings of self-interest on the part of their sons or husbands. “To the poll for the Repealer—against landlord, friend, benefactor—against self-interest, and for your country,” was the universal cry. It was the same in town and country; and the people in their ardour carried every thing before them. To the new Parliament then, they sent in Repealers from all the great Counties, the Cities, and Boroughs of the three Provinces; from Dublin, Cork, Waterford, Limerick, Wexford, Clonmel, Tralee, Ennis, Kilkenny, Athlone, Roscommon, Galway—from the counties of Cork, Dublin, Limerick, Waterford, Tipperary, Mayo, Kerry, Kilkenny, Wexford, Westmeath, King's County, Galway, Sligo, Wicklow, Meath. Nothing could possibly be more decisive of the popular feeling than this universal demonstration. In his capacity of “Recruiting Sergeant” for Repeal, as O'CONNELL called himself, he had no diffi-

culty in filling the ranks. "The time is come," he said, at the Kerry Election—"the time is come when we shall speak with confidence, and hail with pride and pleasure the brightening prospects before us. The period is come when seven centuries of grinding oppression and tyranny must have an end, and Ireland and liberty be vindicated. The banners of Ireland's regeneration have been unfurled, and the mighty phalanx of Repealers is advancing with giant strides through the land, with ANGLESEY and STANLEY their fifer and drummer. I am surprised that the genius of Caricature has not already seized upon the happy idea of representing me as a Recruiting Sergeant, with a broad sword in my hand; ANGLESEY beating the drum, and STANLEY playing the fife; Recruiting not for *Peelers*, but for *Repealers*."

It was a good beginning. "Every thing," he said in 1832, "must have a beginning—our present effort may be only the squibbing of the gun—by the next the shot will be completed. It may now be but the flash in the pan; we shall yet have a light and a *report*"—meaning a Report from a Committee of the House of Commons, recommending the Repeal of the Union.

When the elections were over, then the busy work of agitation recommenced in Dublin. The Association of IRISH VOLUNTEERS was established in January, 1833; and an organization set on foot to raise a national fund to sustain it. The agitation, from the nature of its machinery, was necessarily expensive. Nothing yet alarmed the Government half so much as this new Association. Its mere designation carried danger with it—The Irish Volunteers!—the name suggested 1782; the Dungannon resolutions; the Dublin Convention; the patriotism of armed citizens; and the legislative independence of Ireland. It not only increased the enthusiasm of the people

but it terrified the Ministers. And, to use O'CONNELL'S language—"If the Irish Volunteers were but a name—'*stat nominis umbra*,' it was the shade of a name which sheds credit upon the country to which it belongs."

O'CONNELL was in high spirits. At a meeting of his constituents, to make arrangements for chairing him and his colleague, Mr. RUTHVEN, in the course of a long and eloquent speech he told a story, with his characteristic humour, which indicated how buoyant and triumphant were his feelings. He had good reason to exult, and so he did on this occasion. "A portion of the people," he said, "beat PEEL and WELLINGTON, but when all Ireland was united, he wondered where would they get PEELS and WELLINGTONS enough to beat. How had the people treated him? Three of his sons were in Parliament, two of his sons-in-law, his brother-in-law, his first cousin, and himself. What of that? an anecdote of the reign of GEORGE THE SECOND would explain. An office was vacant near the KING'S person, which his Majesty wished to have filled up by a friend of his own, and wrote to his Minister to that effect; meantime, a borough-mongering lord applied for the situation which the Minister stated it was the KING'S wish to have filled by his own friend, but he offered the borough-monger the reversion of several of the best situations that would soonest become vacant. The suitor persevered with the Minister, reiterating at every new attempt to conciliate him, 'there are seven of us;' and at last compelled the Minister to comply with his demand. Now, there are eight of us," said Mr. O'CONNELL, "and we do not want to get chief justiceships, or colonelcies, or bishoprics; but we will tell the Minister to do justice to Ireland, for there are eight of us. Turn away Lord ANGLESEY, for there are eight of us—send STANLEY hopping, for there are

“ eight of us—dismiss the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for
 “ there are eight of us—and do that for the amicable ad-
 “ justment of the Repeal of the Union, for there are not
 “ only eight of us, but forty other Repealers in the
 “ house, and seven millions out of the eight millions of
 “ Irishmen.”

On the third of January, 1833, at a meeting of the National Political Union, the “ Irish Volunteers” were formed. The principal speaker was, of course, O’CONNELL. At this meeting there occurred a scene in which O’GORMAN MAHON figured. It is exceedingly unpleasant to have to record these things; but, unfortunately, they are matters of history, and cannot be omitted. O’CONNELL often said, that “ while he spoke he was making history.” There could not be a truer saying. His speeches were things, of which his biographers must take notice; and they are also, the best possible commentaries for the future writer to consult, on the contemporary history of Ireland. Therefore the most trifling incident connected with his career is not unimportant.

We have already recorded what occurred in 1830, between O’CONNELL and O’GORMAN MAHON, in Clare.—The impression made in O’CONNELL’S mind by that transaction was never obliterated. When he had concluded his address, and proposed a series of resolutions, O’GORMAN MAHON—we transcribe from the papers of the day—stood up beside O’CONNELL to second the resolutions, and the following altercation immediately ensued :—

“ Mr. O’CONNELL objected to this gentleman’s taking any part in the proceedings, as he was not a member of ‘ the Volunteers.’”

“ O’GORMAN MAHON protested against this attempt at putting him down; and demanded to know by what right Mr. O’CONNELL assumed such a species of domination—(Confusion.)”

“ MR. O'CONNELL read the resolutions entered into by the meeting for the management of its proceedings.

“ O'GORMAN MAHON said he stood upon his right to second the resolutions, and to speak to them, as a member of ‘the Volunteers.’ There, Mr. DWYER, (said he, throwing down a purse,) there are Fifty Pounds as my subscription.

“ MR. O'CONNELL (in the midst of great uproar and confusion) put back the purse, which, we believe, fell at O'GORMAN MAHON's feet.

“ O'GORMAN MAHON—Who are the members of ‘the Volunteers?’—(Here a general commotion prevailed in the room, the members in the rere striving to get forward—a variety of cries were uttered, such as “fair play,” “turn him out,” “order, order,”—“chair,” &c.) I demand of the Chairman, (continued O'GORMAN MAHON,) to produce the names of ‘the Volunteers.’

“ MR. O'CONNELL.—Order, order, Is this man to be permitted—

“ O'GORMAN MAHON—Is this the way to produce conciliation, and promote the co-operation—(Cries of “chair,” “fair play,” and “order.”)

“ MR. C. O'DWYER, M.P., rose to order, and said the question required calm discussion, in order that the Chairman might decide as to the point of order.

“ O'GORMAN MAHON demanded the names of ‘the Volunteers.’

“ MR. O'CONNELL asked would any member of ‘the Irish Volunteers’ call upon the Chairman to produce the names.

“ O'GORMAN MAHON—Yes, I call upon the Chairman (Great uproar.)

“ MR. O'CONNELL—Mr. Chairman, I call upon you to say whether the gentleman is out of order.

“ THE CHAIRMAN decided that he was out of order.

“ O’GORMAN MAHON—I rest upon my right, as an Irishman, to obtain fair play—

“ Mr. O’CONNELL, in a loud voice—“ Chair, chair.”

“ O’GORMAN MAHON—I call Mr. O’CONNELL to order.

“ Here Mr. MAHON’S voice was drowned in a din of many voices, and the most indescribable confusion ensued. There was a rush about Messrs. O’CONNELL and MAHON; and many cries raised, as if in remonstrance against some extreme proceeding. The tables and forms were instantly filled with individuals, all anxious to learn the cause of the commotion. Some said that Mr. O’CONNELL was struck—others, that Mr. MAHON was going to be forced out of the room. “ The scoundrel”—“ fair play”—“ turn him out”—“ order, order”—“ shame, shame,” and many other cries resounded through the room. After comparative order was restored, it was ascertained that a man, in the excitement of the moment, rushed towards Messrs. O’CONNELL and MAHON, but what his intention was remained unexplained; as he was driven back, before he had effected his purpose, whatever it might have been.

“ Mr. C. O’DWYER began to speak to order.

“ O’GORMAN MAHON—I was in possession of the chair.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL—I am a Volunteer, and am, therefore, entitled to speak. Every Society has a right to resolve upon his own rules. Those who do not approve of such rules, are not called upon to associate themselves with it. Mr. Chairman, I call upon you to read the names of “ the Volunteers.” All who are not of the Society are here merely by sufferance.

“ Mr. WALSH addressed the chair, and explained that a meeting was called by public requisition, at twelve o’clock this day, for the purpose of forming ‘ the Society of Irish Volunteers,’ under certain regulations. If Mr. MAHON had attended that meeting, he would have a right

to speak in opposition to any measure which he might have disapproved of, or to have entered his protest against it. But he clearly had no right to come in and disturb that Society, which was 'the Volunteers of Ireland,' as the Political Union had dissolved itself.

"O'GORMAN MAHON—The meeting was called at two o'clock, but met at twelve o'clock. Here Mr. MAHON became inaudible, from the uproar which prevailed.

"Mr. O'CONNELL—Order, order; chair, chair.

"O'GORMAN MAHON called Mr. O'CONNELL to order, and said that the meeting was misled.

"Mr. O'CONNELL—No, no.

"O'GORMAN MAHON—I allege it is; and give me a hearing that I may prove the allegation.

"The tumult continued some time—at length

"Mr. O'CONNELL demanded if such a scene were to be tolerated by the assertion of individual audacity?

"O'GORMAN MAHON—Oh! Mr. O'CONNELL, that is not language to be used to me. But that you are under the protection of a vow, you dare not use it! That's very unfair.

"After the dialogue continued for a few minutes longer, while the same confusion prevailed, the names of the Volunteers were read out by the Secretary. They were 38 in number. The resolutions were then seconded and carried. There were then some 40 or 50 additional members proposed and admitted; O'GORMAN MAHON's name was not among them.

"PETER LOUGHLAN, Esq., was then called to the chair; and the marked, particular, and emphatic thanks of the meeting were moved by Mr. O'CONNELL to Mr. JACOB, for his very proper and dignified conduct in the chair; and the meeting adjourned to Tuesday next, giving three cheers for O'CONNELL, the Repeal of the Union, and the Trades' Union.

“As the assembly were separating, O’GORMAN MAHON got upon the table to address them, when

“Mr. O’CONNELL stood up before him and called upon the meeting to separate. O’GORMAN MAHON still persevered, when Mr. O’CONNELL proceeded to put out the gas lights.

“O’GORMAN MAHON—Is this fair?

“Mr. O’CONNELL.. This room is mine. I call on the meeting to separate.

“O’GORMAN MAHON...Volunteers of Ireland, I wish you success. Though I am not of your body, I will assist you wherever I can.

“O’CONNELL...Gentlemen, follow me.

“O’GORMAN MAHON (following)...It is not the first time I followed you, and supported you, too, Mr. O’CONNELL.

“Mr. O’CONNELL then left the meeting, followed by O’GORMAN MAHON, and the meeting separated.”

At a subsequent meeting of the Volunteers, a few days after, O’CONNELL publicly repeated the charge, which, in 1830, STEELE made against O’GORMAN MAHON, in reference to the collision in Clare, of which we have already given an outline, and on which we have stated our opinion. Such are the disagreeable incidents—the drawbacks of public life.

The meetings of the Irish Volunteers continued.—O’CONNELL was the guiding genius of their proceedings. He was the mouth piece. The other members were listeners. This Association told for the day. It played its part—and there was an end of it. It does not appear to have been, in action, very effective. Its name and its Leader were the only two elements of agitation or of influence it possessed. The Irish Repeal Members, calling themselves a National Council, also assembled before the meeting of Parliament, in Dublin. The Council held a

few meetings. It received some statistical information from Mr. STAUNTON, drew up some documents, deliberated, and then separated. In the interval, every honor was paid O'CONNELL by the citizens of Dublin, as their Representative. He was chaired through the city; and until 1844, in honor of his liberation from Richmond Prison, there never was a more magnificent display of popular gratitude as on that day. He was feted, too, at a public dinner. Every honor was heaped on him. He was at the summit of power. In Parliament, he was referred to as the real, substantial governor of Ireland. Rumours were then circulated that he was about to take place, under Lord GREY's Government. The rumours were a *ruse*, and, of course, unfounded. He never was more determined in his opposition than to the administration with which Lord GREY was connected. Let us here insert a well authenticated anecdote on this subject. It refers to the opinion of an eminent lawyer, given in the hearing of Lord ANGLESEY, at his Excellency's own table, and was in reply to the question "Whether a couple of Terms would restore Mr. O'CONNELL to his former business at the Bar?" "Aye," said the lawyer, 'half a Term—half a week.' He was not two days in the country when the influx of clients proved the correctness of the opinion. With the advantage of his well-merited precedence, there is not a being at the profession who does not believe that O'CONNELL could continue to agitate to his heart's content, and earn the income of a Secretary of State, with not the one-third of a useful Secretary's toil or solitudes. What temptations can office have for such a man? None decidedly of a personal nature, and it is the merest delusion to suppose the contrary. Whatever may be said or thought in England of the public acts of Mr. O'CONNELL, it is only to deceive the people (mischievously, perhaps fatally to deceive them)

to accuse him of having for a motive a desire of personal aggrandizement."

At this time many districts of Ireland were in a very alarming state. Agrarian outrage had made its appearance in several counties, notwithstanding O'CONNELL's earnest, eloquent, and oft-repeated injunctions to the contrary. Undoubtedly he repressed turbulence and combination to a certain extent. He sent Mr. STEELE and other PACIFICATORS amongst the people, and anxiously endeavoured to dissuade them. The Clergy were unceasing in their advice. These efforts were in some measure successful. But the spirit of the people was so much exasperated against the tithe system, that it was found impossible to produce in them a tolerant, a lamb-like forbearance.

STANLEY's last Tithe Act had driven them to madness. It was a favorite sentiment of his—"that they should be made to respect the law before they loved it." In thus endeavouring to reverse the natural order, by which obedience to the laws is best secured, he forced the people to resistance, to outrage, and to frightful crime. Instead of the tranquillity STANLEY wished his tithe measure would produce, it had directly the opposite effect.—"Of that act," to adopt the eloquent language of BERWICK, in speaking of it—"the cherished child of STANLEY's Christian policy—that act that was to set upon its legs the prostrate majesty of the law, restore contentment to the public mind, and root for ever in the people's heart, the blessed union of the church and state; the enactments were not loose—indictment followed indictment—prosecution followed prosecution, with a terrible velocity. The arm of justice waxed faint and weary, as it smote the nation with this new engine of oppression. Everything was propitious to its dreadful operation. The yell of the Conservative hailed it on its way—the

Hosannah of the parson bade it welcome—the charge of the pliant judge, the verdict of the packed jury were not wanting to enforce it; the jails were glutted with its victims; the land was soaked in its own gore; if, indeed, that blood has sunk into the earth. Where are the promised fruits? Where is the vindicated majesty of the law? Where is the restored tranquillity?” The vindicated majesty of the law was developed in insubordination—the restored tranquillity was displayed in nightly outrage and destruction of property. Such was the result of STANLEY’S tithe legislation of 1832. He advanced £60,000 to the Clergy. He collected £12,000; and the cost of collection came to £15,000!!

It was attempted by the Ministers, and particularly by PEEL, in the course of the debates in Parliament, to connect the disturbance prevailing in some Counties, with the political agitation; and, in fact, to place on O’CONNELL the whole responsibility. There never was a more unjustifiable proceeding. As we have frequently in this MEMOIR established, there could not exist a man more opposed than he was to the horrible White Boy system; no matter what name the midnight marauders assumed—he warred against them all; and for a good political reason, because exclusive altogether of the religious and moral principles which were outraged, every crime committed and every disturbance created—every injury done to property “gave strength to the enemy,” and served to retard, far more than to extend, human liberty. And it is a singular fact, that as constitutional agitation increased, agrarian crimes—and secret societies diminished. O’CONNELL’S principle was, publicity in every thing—By publicity—by open discussion he hoped to achieve his object. How could such a system have any relation to the secret and criminal proceedings

of Whitefeet and Hurlers, and Terry Alts, whom the mischievous policy of the Government had aroused? How could such a system, so constitutional, and requisite for the redress of grievances in a free country, be any encouragement to outrage and insubordination? No! the whole object of O'CONNELL's life was to teach the people to reach freedom and obtain justice by the paths of VIRTUE. What is the consequence? Crimes, which during PEEL's Irish Secretaryship, disgraced the country, are no longer known; though the people, as we write, are suffering the utmost destitution.

It was during this state of affairs in Ireland, the first Reformed Parliament assembled, and the KING, from the Throne, recommended measures of coercion for Ireland. O'CONNELL called it a "brutal and bloody" speech. Lord JOHN RUSSELL moved that these words should be taken down; but the Speaker decided that whereas the speech was, constitutionally, the speech not of the KING, but of those responsible for it—the Ministers—the expression was allowable. Mr. O'CONNELL, in a brilliant speech, moved an amendment to the address. A debate arose, which was adjourned for several days, one after another. The Coercion Bill, which may be called the concentration of the Insurrection and Algerine Acts, after a noble resistance from O'CONNELL, passed into law. The Bill was first introduced in the House of Lords, and then sent to the Commons. O'CONNELL's conduct, during this session of Parliament, if there were no other grounds, should immortalise him. He had then reached his highest eminence as a Parliamentary debater. His energy—his fire, and determined perseverance—his fearless courage—those who witnessed the debates on the Coercion Bill will not readily forget. Throughout Ireland his speeches were read with intense interest. He

never was so successful. But he never afterwards took so prominent a part in the House of Commons. His formidable antagonist was STANLEY. It must be admitted, that in debate he was O'CONNELL'S equal. His readiness was surprising, and the bitterness of his invective could scarcely be surpassed. He evidently had a personal hostility to O'CONNELL. He never could forget the expressive and sarcastic title of "Arms Bill STANLEY," given him by O'CONNELL, nor the attacks for his conduct in the Irish Government. His spleen was overflowing, and it infused indescribable venom into his rejoinders. He was clearly a match for O'CONNELL. He was the only one the LIBERATOR encountered on equal terms. On the first night of the session, he taunted O'CONNELL with dilating so much on his panacea—Repeal—abroad; and daring not to whisper it within the house: and he told him that "the people of England would resist it to the death." There was truth in the statement. But O'CONNELL wished, in the first instance, to secure in Ireland a powerful party for the question, before he ventured to introduce it to the notice and adjudication of a hostile Parliament. He knew well what its fate would be, unsupported by the whole nation, and wisely bided his time. He wished to accumulate the pressure from without. Besides, there is a probability that he expected for Ireland great boons from the Reformed Parliament; and was disposed to collect his strength and choose his ground, before he finally flung away the scabbard. From letters he wrote even after the KING'S speech, it is evident he did not expect a violent measure of Coercion. He must have thought that permanent special commissions, of which he himself approved, would have been established. In that case, he would have supported the Government, in their measure; for he was most anxious to suppress the agrarian outrages in Ireland by the strength

of Constitutional law, when remonstrance and exhortation failed. He never expected that all political associations were to be extinguished or put down, or the country proclaimed, otherwise than as he advised, by the Lord Lieutenant. He was not prepared to find that from sunset to sunrise no person should appear outside doors, in proclaimed districts ;—that no meetings of any kind, for petitioning or otherwise, should be held; that the ordinary tribunals of justice would be superseded, and martial law established—that the dwelling of the subject would be broken into at any hour of the night; and any of the inmates, if absent then, seized afterwards, tried by Court-martial, and transported; neither did he anticipate that the Habeas Corpus Act would be virtually suspended, with regard to all political offences. O'CONNELL did not expect that a law of that tyrannical and sweeping character would be the first act of a Reformed Parliament. He exerted his utmost energies to establish the franchises on which that Parliament was elected. It was by the Irish Representatives Reform was gained for England; and O'CONNELL little thought the instrument he had assisted to forge and sharpen, would be first used against his country. He was then naturally inclined to give the new Parliament a trial, and for that course, he was taunted by STANLEY, and rebuked by his own friends. He even at that time went further than mere silence; he expressly said, if justice were done his country by the Reformed Parliament, he would be satisfied. His words were remarkable—They are as follows :—

“ For my own part, I have been accused of intentions that I never dreamt of; and if I feared calumny, I should long since have quitted the arena of politics. I care not how much I am calumniated, when the vials of defamation are poured upon me on account of my exertions in

behalf of my country. I deserve not calumny ; and the English people will see that I do not, when I say, in my justification—if justification in my case be necessary—that I have ever been, and still am, most attached to a British connexion. Such an avowal may be turned against me in Ireland, but I risk everything rather than abandon truth. Yes, as long as I saw the utility of the connexion, and an immense utility may exist, I should prefer seeing this house doing justice to my countrymen, rather than it should be done by a local Legislature. I repeat it, that this avowal is likely to be turned against me in Ireland ; but I adhere to it, for it is my abstract opinion. If I thought that the machinery of the present Government would work well for Ireland, there never lived a man more ready to facilitate its movements than I am. The only reason I have for being a Repealer, is the injustice of the present Government towards my country.”

The speech from which we take the foregoing extract was delivered in February, in the House of Commons, on the first introduction of the Coercion Bill in the Lords. It was spoken on the motion for the House going into a committee of supply. STANLEY endeavoured several times to stop him, on the ground that it was irregular to allude to what was taking place in the other House. O'CONNELL evaded the irregularity, and in a most masterly and impressive speech, took to pieces the measure of Coercion which was going with a rapid pace through the House of Lords. From that time until late in the month of April, O'CONNELL, aided by SHIEL, FERGUS O'CONNOR, and other Irish Members, maintained the resistance against the measure, and an incessant fusillade against the Government. When the Bill came from the Lords, its first reading was opposed, and a debate arose

which was repeatedly adjourned. O'CONNELL wound it up by the greatest speech he ever delivered in Parliament. He was four hours and five minutes on his legs, during which he was listened to with profound attention. He described, as a Lawyer, the dreadful provisions of this "tremendous" bill—to use the expression of Dr. BOYTON, in reference to it. He illustrated the tyranny of the enactment, by a few anecdotes connected with trial by Court Martial :—

“ A witness, named GRADY, when examined at a trial, on looking at the person, declared that he had been mistaken—that he was not the man—that he could not swear to his person. He was asked whether he did not swear to his identity at a former trial? Yes, he replied, but he was not then present, and I had no opportunity of identifying him. What was the consequence? He was ordered out and received a hundred lashes! He was again brought in, desired to look at the man, and asked whether he could now identify him. He still refused to commit perjury, and he was ordered to receive a hundred lashes more. He received in all, three hundred lashes; and the trial only ended in consequence of his falling into a dead faint, from which he was, with difficulty, recovered. Then,” continued O'CONNELL, “ there was the celebrated case of Sir EDWARD CROSBY, who was tried before a Court-Martial. He hoped the House would bear with him, if not for his sake, at least for the sake of the son of that Sir EDWARD CROSBY, while he read a passage from a letter, which proved, almost beyond a doubt, the innocence of his lamented father. In the letter the writer was kind enough to express his gratitude to him, and it went on to state, that a fact came to the writer's knowledge a few days ago (the letter being dated in 1826) which gave a decided confirmation to the generally re-

ceived opinion of his (the present Sir EDWARD CROSBY'S) lamented father's innocence, and that his death was little other than a murder. The letter went on to state, that when Major DUNDAS, a relation of General DUNDAS, and who commanded the district, received the report of the Court-Martial, he at once saw that the sentence was most unjust, and that the evidence did not bear out the conviction. He immediately sent an express to stop all further proceedings, and with an order for the release of Sir EDWARD. The commander at Carlow, however, anticipated that a reprieve would be sent, and, in order to prevent the possibility of its interference, had the unhappy gentleman shot, by torch light, one hour before the express arrived! This letter was written and signed by the Rev. ARCHIBALD DOUGLAS, the brother-in-law of Sir EDWARD CROSBY. And was he to be told that courts such as these were the proper courts by which offences in his country were to be tried? An Hon. Member had called out to him to name any court martial whose powers were abused. He did name—he named this—and he asked the hon. Member what he thought of this Court. In one of the southern counties, there was an attorney, who had partly inherited, and in the course of his practice partly made, considerable landed property; part of this property was subject to a judgment debt to a lady—not an uncommon mode at that time amongst Roman Catholics for providing for their families. The lady had three sons—one of them living as a country gentleman, another at college, and the third at school. The attorney was what was denominated a loyal magistrate of 1798. This attorney caused her three sons to be arrested, and thrown into gaol. The attorney then wrote to the mother, who, it seemed, had commenced proceedings for the recovery of the judgment, to inform her that unless she immediately released the debt, her

three sons should be hanged in Limerick. If the hon. Secretary would ask the Cursitor of the Court of Chancery in Limerick, he would inform him that the lady was his own mother, that she was thrown into prison, that he also suffered a long imprisonment, during which he was treated with much cruelty, and manacled with irons sixty-eight pounds weight. The Court Martial, however did not take place.—From day to day, the mother was threatened; her affection for her sons was strong, but her firmness was equal to her affection. She inflexibly refused to yield her rights. She was not tried by the court martial, but was brought up to the assizes and discharged by proclamation, but the following day she was sent back to gaol.”

Every position he took up against the Bill he illustrated with cases in point, which exhibited his marvellous recollection. One instance, in particular, was remarkable; for it showed how readily and aptly, on all occasions, his memory came to his assistance. Sir ROBERT PEEL, during his address, told a most affecting tale. It ran thus :—

“ He recollected a man, a resident in the County of Clare, who came to Dublin for the purpose of giving him (Sir R. Peel) information respecting the perpetrators of a certain outrage. Now, that man, though he was fully convinced that he was marked out for the vengeance of the friends of the person he had been the means of bringing to justice, yet the strong desire he felt of revisiting his native spot, and embracing his wife and child, overcame every consideration of personal security. He (Sir R. PEEL) knew the man’s danger, and earnestly advised him not to go. His advice, however, was not accepted, and some weeks after the man had taken up his abode with his family—an attack was made upon

his house by nine or ten men, who, after much deliberation, had come with the deadly determination of immolating their innocent victim. They attacked the house while he was asleep; they broke open the door, called out the man—they murdered him with pitchforks. And this bloody work did they perpetrate in the hearing of his wife and child—a child only nine years of age!—Now, let the house mark what he was about to relate. While her husband was yet in the struggles of death, the mother took the child, and placing it in a recess by the fire-place, she said—such was her heroic fortitude—and such her almost incredible self-possession, even with the frightful cries of her expiring husband ringing in her ears—she said to her infant—“ You hear the cries of your dying father. I shall certainly be the next victim. When they have murdered him, they will murder me, too; but I will struggle with them as long as I am able, in order to give you time to do what I place you here for. My last act shall be to place this lighted turf upon the hearth. Do you, by its glare, mark the faces of the murderers. Mind that you watch them narrowly, that you may know, and be able to tell who they are; and so avenge the cruel death of your parents.” (It is impossible to describe the sensation which this narration produced upon the house.) “ As the unhappy woman said, so it fell out. The butchers, after completing their bloody work upon the man, barbarously murdered the woman also. After a short, but unsuccessful struggle with the ruthless miscreants, she was dragged from the cottage, and inhumanly slain upon the bleeding body of her husband. But the child had carefully obeyed the last injunctions of its mother—had closely scanned the faces of the murderers—was able to identify them—and by the evidence of that child, corroborated by other evi-

dence, five of the wretches who committed this horrid deed, were convicted, and hanged within a month after the perpetration of the crime. That child was, for some years afterwards, under his (Sir R. PEEL's) protection."

It was said that O'CONNELL turned to a friend near him; and stated the particulars of the entire transaction.

The first reading of this Bill, which O'CONNELL described as a bill legislating against an individual, that is against himself, was carried by a majority of "four hundred and sixty-six to eighty-seven." Nothing could exceed his indignation, during the progress of the debate. He endeavoured to rouse the radical party outside doors to exertions in favor of his country. Some meetings were held; but on the whole, he was not successful. It was at one of the meetings that, speaking of the House of Commons, he asked whether the people of England would allow the liberties of their fellow-subjects to be cloven down by SIX HUNDRED SCOUNDRELS. He continued in Parliament, fighting the Bill, clause by clause, in committee. At last it received, in April, a third reading, by a majority of three hundred and sixty-three to eighty-four, and became Law. This terminated O'CONNELL's greatest Parliamentary effort.

The Coercion Bill became law, notwithstanding the powerful agitation against it in Ireland. It became law in spite of her Representatives. It damaged for ever the character of the Whigs; and lost for the Reformed Parliament, the *prestige* with which it was surrounded; and it increased, accordingly, the popular desire for Repeal.

During these remarkable debates in both Houses, on the Coercion Act, the speaking on both sides, was worthy of the best days of English Parliamentary oratory—Lord GREY, Lord BROUGHAM, STANLEY, PEEL, MACAULEY, were the great guns on one side; O'CONNELL and SHIEL

on the other. A striking article in the *New Monthly*, which appeared about the time, drew a most truthful comparison between the oratorical characteristics of these eminent men. Though long, we insert it, for it possesses enduring merit.

“ Perhaps, in no representative assembly, were there ever as many good speakers as there are now in the House of Commons. An officer of the House, who has attended it for thirty years, told us, that nothing could be more surprising, in point of contrast, than the number of, even tolerable speakers, now, as compared with the number of, even tolerable speakers, formerly. Yet, of these excellent speakers, no one can be said to have manifested the very highest order of eloquence. The great characteristic of the oratory of the senate, is commonplace. The fine speakers decorate it; the sensible speakers deliver it oracularly; the fiery speakers pour it forth as if it were the inspiration of genius; but it is still common place. Nothing new or refining in thought—nothing heart-stirring in sentiment—ever passes the lips either of Mr. STANLEY or Sir R. PEEL, the two leaders of the nightly skirmish or the pitched battle. Mr. STANLEY, never professes to pass a certain limit in eloquence. Bold, clear, correct and ready, he never aspires to the command of the passions, or the mastery of the heart. His mind is peculiarly formed to grapple with the necessities of debate; he fears nothing, and he omits nothing. He meets the foe on what point soever, no matter how critical. He observes every advantage to be gained, and never fails to make the utmost of it. Far less imposing than Sir ROBERT PEEL, he is far more natural. No artificiality ever mingles itself with his stern simplicity of action and of air. In the remarkable plainness of his energetic and vigorous delivery, and in the lucid purity of his diction, he differs essentially from all his contem-

poraries—from the elaborate and over studied BROUGHAM—from the swelling solemnity of PEEL—from the graceful floridity of CANNING, from the artful effects of SHEIL—from the infinite combinations of tone and gesture, which the experience of a life has *taught* to O'CONNELL. The genius of a clever, bold, shrewd, but material and unenthusiastic people, cannot be better incorporated than in the oratory of Mr. STANLEY. He is completely English. He is an admirable speaker, yet he is scarcely an eloquent one. It may be that he wants not the genius, but the heart, for eloquence. The fierceness of his temper is a less disadvantage to him than the coldness of his disposition. His soul seems to expand when he throws himself upon a fallacy, but to move slow and mechanically, when he advances upon any generous truth. Your admiration is often chilled by his very talents. There is something small in a prudence of affections, which does not communicate to the temper. What so attractive as the large-mindedness of amiability? If Mr. STANLEY is English in the one phrase of the character, Lord GREY is thoroughly English in the other. It is impossible to see, to hear, a man on whom is more vividly impressed the stamp of "noble." The lofty brow—the delicate features—the commanding person—the frank dignity of air—all are noble; the sentiments, the eloquence, correspond with the person and the mein. A high and haughty, yet magnanimous and unrepulsive, spirit breathes throughout him. *Homme de sang et de feu*, may be said of him, as of *Bussy d'Ambois*. But to him, though the finest and most dignified speaker of his day, may, as to Mr. STANLEY, he denied the attribute of eloquence, in its loftiest sense. The eloquence of CHATHAM lies, for the most part, in bold and vigorous declamation—of SHERIDAN, in a gaudy pageantry of words, of BURKE, (and of

BROUGHAM no less), in the stately diction of an elaborate essay. One of the few instances of this class of oratory (though in a much lower degree) that occur to us amongst our contemporaries, is to be found in a speech of Mr. CROKER's, in the debates on the Reform Bill. Speaking of the danger that might await the House of Commons by any successful attempt to destroy the House of Lords, he slowly approached the table; and, fixing his eyes upon the leader of the ministerial majority, said, "Count the number of days that elapsed after the House of Commons had voted away the existence of the hereditary Chamber, before CROMWELL ordered this bauble (*touching the mace*) to be removed from your table!" The look, the tone, the air of the speaker, all aided the effect. Nothing could be more eloquent; yet it was only an appeal to a simple historical fact. We are now speaking of English eloquence, and shall not, therefore, illustrate our subject by any long examples from the Irish, a people among whom, vivid and imaginative, that art may hereafter thrive in its highest glory—that is to say, so soon as political excitement, being somewhat sobered in that unfortunate country, will leave the judgment to cool and the taste to refine—when extravagant metaphors and tumid language, will give way to a more truthful, yet not less powerful energy of diction and logic of thought. We may see, indeed, that, in Mr. O'CONNELL, the great master of the fierce popular mind, there is little of the floridity or inflation that usually characterises the oratory of his countrymen. His great art is in "stating a question." He places it on the most invincible ground he can select; and the iron vigour of his intellect is seldom concealed beneath any holyday wreaths. Unlike Mr. STANLEY, he owes the effect of his oratory to his apparent sympathy with all generous emotions. When he indulges in them, his eye

glisters, and the deep music of his unrivalled voice seems to halt and falter. This may be the result of his art—for he is a most experienced artist—but it has the semblance of nature. Never, perhaps, has he produced a more triumphant effect over his audience, than the one when replying to Mr. STANLEY on the Irish Coercion Bill, he arrested himself suddenly from the course of fiery invective, in which he had prepared you to suppose he was about to enter:—“ But the Right Honourable Gentlemen,” said he, with a changed and softened tone, “ has declared that Ireland ‘ is dear to him.’—I thank him for that assurance. I retract whatever I have said harshly. I forbear whatever of more angry emotion was about to rise to my lips. The man who can tell me that Ireland is dear to him ceases to be my enemy !” Through the whole hostile majority, there was a painful movement ; there was scarcely a man amongst them who did not seem touched. Of a totally different mind from Mr. O’CONNELL, Mr. SHEIL yet differs in ONE respect from the Irish orators in general, and assimilates to Mr. O’CONNELL in particular—he is LOGICAL. With all the glow and dazzle of a diction, which is, however, beginning to refine itself from the antithetical point and redundant ornament which first rather militated against his success in a cold English assembly, he united a remarkable clearness of reasoning, and his very love for antithesis in words, leads to that antithesis of argument which, in itself, is a syllogism. It is true, perhaps, that this power of reasoning would be more apparent if his action were less apparent, and his gestures more free from those quick and restless alternations, which suggest to his audience the semblance of study, as well as the desire of declamation. If he thought of effect less, he would be more effective ; and if less warm, he would seem to Englishmen (we think coldness is sincerity) to be more sin-

ere. But no speaker, perhaps, is more popular in the House; less from his genius, which is remarkable—his logic, which is severe—his knowledge, which is searching and close, embracing a thousand details in its grasp of a principle, than from his power of sarcasm—his biting, yet pleasant irony—his matchless art of proving the inconsistency, the weakness, or the dishonesty, while seemingly flattering the virtues, of his antagonist. Mr. MACAULAY, charging, with all his mighty force, the principles of the opposite army, seldom stops to notice, and yet, more rarely, to assault any individual warrior; on rolls the rapid and glittering array of his passionate words, of his large, but somewhat unsolid theories, overwhelming the *cause* of his opponent—but seeming to disdain the opponents themselves. It is this which makes him, in orations, triumphant, beyond all his contemporaries—but unfits him for the short-sword grapple, and hand in hand contention of debate. He cannot move without an army of words at the heels of his argument. He will not parry and thrust with a single individual—he is wonderful in the general battle, but comparatively unartful in a duel. It is probable, however, that long practice will bring him skill in this last and more frequent method of engagement, and, as he rises into power, the practice will become necessary and constant. Perhaps, take him altogether, this most remarkable man possesses greater oratorical powers than any *Englishman* of his day. He approaches to that eloquence which *does* address the passions—he incites—he stirs—he kindles—while he speaks. But the fault is, that the impression is transitory. He does not condemn, sufficiently, the use of such sophistries as will not bear the reflection of the next day. Sir ROBERT PEEL is the accomplished senator, expressing his sentiments, often erroneous, often shallow, often commonplace, but still *his*

own—however adorned by his felicities of phrase—however enforced by a solemnity of delivery (which, if somewhat overwrought in itself, accords well with his station, and the peculiar character of his mind)—you cannot but feel that all the opinions he utters are not borrowed for the occasion, but are part and parcel of the man. Mr. MACAULAY speaks as an orator—Sir ROBERT PEEL as a senator. But it may yet be reserved for Mr. MACAULAY to furnish out all the deficiencies of his great genius; to fulfil a destiny for which, as yet, his talents, rather than his character adapt him; he clings too closely to a party; his fault is timidity—he nurses both his reputation and his fortunes too tenderly. Nature meant him to be a leader, and he prefers being a successful gladiator.”

The anecdote we have related of O’CONNELL’S tenacity of recollection reminds us of another of different character which it will not be out of place to relate here :—

At Darrynane, there extends down from the House and close to the sea, with a fine white sandy strand to the water’s edge—and a green lawn, where he used to sit—either enjoying the wrestling or hurling or other rural and manly sports he delighted to encourage. Here too he sat in judgment on the disputes of the country people, and as arbitrator, decided their differences. He was one morning sitting as usual on this green—surrounded by country people—some asking his advice—some his assistance—others making their grievances known. Amongst the rest was a farmer rather advanced in life—a swaggering sort of fellow, who was desirous to carry his point by impressing the LIBERATOR with the idea of his peculiar honesty and respectability. He was anxious that O’CONNELL should decide a matter in dispute between him and a neighbouring farmer who, he wished to insinuate, was not as good as he ought to be. “For my

“ part, I, at least, can boast that neither I or mine were
 “ ever brought before a judge or sent to jail, however
 “ it was with others.” “ Stop, stop, my fine fellow,”
 cried the LIBERATOR—“ Let me see,” pausing a mo-
 moment. “ Let me see ; it is now just twenty-five years
 “ ago, last August, that I myself saved you from being
 “ transported, and had you discharged from the dock.”
 The man was thunderstruck ; he thought such a matter
 could not be retained in the great man's mind. He
 shrunk away ; murmuring that he should get justice else-
 where, and never appeared before the LIBERATOR after-
 wards.

Previous to the introduction of the Coercion Bill into
 the Commons, Lord ALTHORPE brought in his Church
 Temporalities measure. It met the approval of O'CON-
 NELL, and it was this measure that induced him to think
 that Government intended to follow a wise and concilia-
 tory policy.

He was mistaken. Speaking of this Bill, Mr. BER-
 WICK, in the speech from which we have quoted, thus ac-
 knowledged the *quantum* of gratitude with which he re-
 ceived it. It must, however, be borne in mind that he
 spoke of it when the Coercion Bill was careering
 through Parliament—“ But, Sir, I am told the minis-
 ters will redress grievances. The ministers are reform-
 ing the church—let them destroy the constitution. The
 ministers will give a Bishop only £9,000 per annum—
 let us make them a present of the Habeas Corpus. The
 ministers have abolished the church cess—let them abol-
 ish the trial by jury. The ministers will reduce the
 number of Bishops from twenty-two to twelve—let them
 wield the horrors of martial law against the people.
 What, are we to be bribed into a surrender of every sacred
 right, because twopence per acre is taken off the country ?

I denounce the slavish and unthrifty principle that would balance against liberty, not pounds and shillings, but pence and halfpence. I denounce the church reform; I say it is a public fraud, to call that paltry, stingy measure an adequate reform. Is that an adequate reform that pays to the priesthood of a handful, an annual stipend of a million? Is that a reform, for which we should barter liberty, that still leaves in the poorest country upon earth, the richest and most gorgeous church? Is that a reform to give the followers of Him, who had not where to lay his head, eight or nine thousand pounds a year? What boots it to the country, whether twelve or twenty mitred princes feed upon the poor man's sweat and toil; if that toil and sweat are still to be applied to feed the ravens of a glutton church? Where is the abolition of the pest, tithe? Where is the cleansing of the House of Lords, of that mitred phalanx, arrayed in perpetual and inveterate hostility against the people? Let us not, I say, be bribed by the shadow of a church reform—a church, which its own corruption must destroy—to surrender the substantial blessing of liberty and constitution.”

Notwithstanding this fervid denunciation from our excellent and eloquent friend, we must say, that the Church Temporalities Bill was a step in the right direction. It inserted the sharp point of the wedge.—It declared that Parliament had the right of interference with church property; it justified the subsequent scheme of appropriation. Yet it had STANLEY'S concurrence.

The following is a summary of the plan embodied in the Bill:—

“1—CHURCH CESS TO BE IMMEDIATELY AND ALTOGETHER ABOLISHED. This is a direct pecuniary relief to the amount of about £80,000 per annum.

“2—A reduction of the number of Archbishops and Bishops prospectively, from four Archbishops and eigh-

teen Bishops, to two Archbishops and ten Bishops ; the appropriation of the revenues of the suppressed Sees to the General Church Funds.

“ Archbishops to be reduced to Bishops :—Cashel and Tuam.

“ Bishops [10] to be abolished, and the duties to be transferred to other sees—Dromore to Down ; Raphoe to Derry ; Clogher to Armagh ; Elphin to Kilmore ; Killala to Tuam ; Clonfert to Killaloe ; Cork to Cloyne ; Waterford to Cashel ; Ossory to Ferns ; Kildare to Dublin.

“ 3—A general tax on all Bishops, from 5 to 15 per cent., to be imposed immediately.

“ 4—AN IMMEDIATE REDUCTION FROM THE BISHOPRIC OF DERRY, and a prospective reduction from the primacy, in addition to the tax ; the amount to be paid to the General Church Fund.

“ N.B.—The net incomes of all the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland amount to £130,000. The plan will effect a reduction of about £60,000.

“ 5—An immediate tax on all benefices, from 5 to 15 per cent., in lieu of first fruits, which are hereafter to cease. Benefices under £200 to be exempt, and the tax to be graduated according to the value. Total income of parochial clergy under £600,000.

“ 6—An abolition of all SINECURE DIGNITIES, and appropriation of their revenues to the general fund.

“ 7—Commissioners to be appointed to administer the fund, and apply it—1st, to ordinary church cess ; surplus to augmentation of poor livings, assistance in building glebe houses, churches, dividing unions, &c.

“ 8—Commissioners to have the power, with consent of Privy Council, of dividing and altering limits of parishes.

“ 9. Also WHERE NO DUTY HAS BEEN PERFORMED, NOR MINISTER RESIDENT, FOR THREE YEARS before the passing

of the act, Commissioners to have power to SUSPEND APPOINTMENT (if in the gift of Crown or Church), and apply proceeds to general fund.

“10. Tenants of Bishops’ leases to be empowered to purchase the perpetuity of their leases at a fixed and moderate amount, subject to a corn rent equal to the amount now annually paid in shape of rent and fine.

“N.B.—This is the application to the Bishops’ leases of the principle of the Composition Act, so far as it precludes the possibility of future increase.

“11. THE PROCEEDS ON THESE LEASES to be paid to the State, and APPLICABLE TO ANY PURPOSES CONNECTED WITH THE CHURCH. The amount, if all purchase at a low rate, will be from £2,500,000 to £3,000,000 sterling.

“The commutation of tithes for land, and the laws of enforcing residence, and prohibiting pluralities, to be the subject of other bill.”

This measure, after a fruitless opposition in the Lords, passed into law with some amendments, introduced by STANLEY, for the purpose of guarding against the principle of appropriation. The 147th clause, which in some degree recognised the right of Parliament to appropriate Church property, was abandoned by Ministers, after a most strenuous opposition from O’CONNELL. His speech on that occasion is thus described by the private correspondent of the *Cork Southern Reporter* :—

“Mr. O’CONNELL followed in the debate, and he was just the man, and precisely in the vein, to deal with the Secretary. He made one of the most eloquent and *smashing* speeches I ever heard from him; tearing to pieces and demolishing without mercy, but with tremendous effect, the sophistries and the fallacies by which the Right Hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to delude the House. Almost every sentence was marked by cheers,

and that most when, in conclusion, he told the Ministry to carry their apology to Carlton Terrace, where no doubt it would be, if it had not already been, accepted. Smarting under this speech, Mr. STANLEY rose, in bad temper and with exasperated feelings, and made a most furious reply, which met a reception such as no speech of his ever met before—startling exclamations, occasionally declaring the surprise which *some* of his positions created, while at other times bursts of laughter told of the ridicule which he was bringing on himself.”

STANLEY was no longer Secretary for Ireland. He received promotion in the Government; he was appointed Colonial Secretary, and commissioned to frame a plan of emancipation for the West India slaves, and of compensation, in the shape of twenty millions sterling, for the West India planters. Ireland got rid of him. He was the most unpopular Secretary that ever held the office. He and Mr. Solicitor-General CRAMPTON, and Mr. Attorney-General BLACKBURNE, succeeded in making the government of a well disposed, but hot-headed nobleman, detested by the people; though there existed throughout the country an undefined consciousness that he was not so much to blame. His chivalry and his pride induced him to take all responsibility on his own shoulders. He desired to put aside poor Sir WILLIAM GOSSETT, his secretary; lest he should participate in any of that responsibility. But, notwithstanding all this, the blame of the misgovernment of Ireland was put upon the right shoulders, upon STANLEY'S. “He was the head and front of the offending.” He was a man of extraordinary mental powers—great eloquence—great moral courage—high aristocratic notions, and a haughtiness that carried every thing before him. Yet, with all his talent, he was indolent; and would prefer a day's amusement to any political triumph. He spent very little

of his time in Ireland. To be a "shave-beggar" was beneath him. Had he discretion and industry commensurate with his talents, he ought, like PITT, to have ascended at once to the rank of Prime Minister, without the hardship of learning the trade of statesmanship amongst the intractable Irish—Mr. LITTLETON succeeded him. We shall soon see how O'CONNELL shelved that gentleman.

The Irish Volunteers were instantly suppressed, on the passing of the Coercion Act. O'CONNELL had again recourse to the epistolary mode of addressing the Irish people. Letters answered his purpose quite as well as speeches. True, in those documents the vivid flashes which astonished and delighted both the listener and reader of his speeches, were not discernible. But his letters always were remarkable for their extraordinary clearness. There was no mistaking his meaning. In letter-writing, for the information on the most complicated subject of the people at large, he had no competitor. COBBETT came nearest to him. JUNIUS, though more chaste, had no other pretensions to compete with him. But how did he manage to throw off column after column of those long epistles, beginning "firstly" and ending "twenty-fifthly," or thereabouts? He in latter years employed an amanuensis. Very often the first comer acted the part. While he dictated, he used converse with those about him, on indifferent subjects—nay, occupy himself with other matters; and when the amanuensis had concluded a sentence, he again dictated, and so on to the end. Even legal opinions he dictated in the same manner. His letters, on the passing of the Coercion Bill, were very elaborate and strong in language. It was in these letters he called the Government "base Whigs"—"base, bloody, and brutal Whigs."

O'CONNELL had an opportunity this year of aiding in

the triumph of a cause to which he was, from his youth upwards, ardently devoted;—the emancipation of the Negro slaves of our West India Colonies. It is the glory of the British people, that cheerfully and anxiously they came forward, and not only demanded freedom for their fellow-men, but also, in the spirit of honesty for which they are remarkable, paid TWENTY MILLIONS to the Slave-owners as compensation. Morally and religiously speaking, there was no property in slaves; and even if there were, experience has shewn that their emancipation rather served than injured West India property; and therefore on the same principle that a jury will give but little compensation for a road, which in running through, and taking away some of the land—improves the rest, the people of England would have been justified in little or no compensation. But, when they had a glorious object to advance, they cared not for expense in accomplishing it. They preferred to do it nobly and generously, rather than risk the injury of individuals in the triumph of humanity. Mr. O'CONNELL, though on principle opposed to compensation, and to the apprenticeship system, still aided in carrying the great measure. He had often before done good service to the cause of Negro regeneration, at the meetings in the provinces of the Anti-Slavery Society. In Cork, he once made a memorable display. It was at a meeting at which some of the great shining lights of the Negro cause attended, amongst others, the celebrated Independent Minister, Mr. BURNETT—one of the most eloquent men of the day. The meeting was crowded to excess—principally by ladies; and of these a great number were of the SOCIETY OF FRIENDS; that humane and most respected Christian Community, who, in Ireland, will be ever spoken of with gratitude, for their noble conduct and their

princely munificence in behalf, this year (1847), of suffering Ireland. Mr. O'CONNELL, we need not say, was not popular with such a meeting. He was a Catholic—they had strong anti-Catholic prejudices. He was a popular agitator; the meeting was composed of high Conservatives, to whose mind O'CONNELL was always presented as an arch disturber—a rebel—a very BEELZEBUB. At that time nothing could exceed the embittered feelings of the class, of whom this assembly was composed, towards the LIBERATOR. Still, there was a correspondingly intense desire to hear him. He rose amidst the most profound silence. He made some trivial observations, suggested by something which occurred before him, as if he actually rose for no other purpose. This was generally his plan. It gave an air of ease and non-pretension to what might afterwards turn out a most finished elaborate discourse. It made his audience at ease both with him and themselves. Then he threw off a few jokes—which put them in good humour, and, lastly, adjusting his wig, plunged into the middle of his subject. This was precisely the course he adopted at the meeting we allude to. He knew the personal prejudices he had to contend with—but he knew that the audience were as enthusiastic in the cause of the negro as himself. He went on describing, as he alone could—the sufferings of the slave—particularly of the female slave; enlarged on the atrocities of the African Slave traffic; showed how much it had increased, and its cruelties increased until it was abandoned by England; boasted of his native land never owning a slaveship; inveighed against free America, for its cruel inconsistency on this subject; quoted the scriptures familiarly in favor of human liberty; and at last sat down amidst the waving of handkerchiefs from the ladies, whose ne-

thusiasm he had awakened almost to ecstasy; whose lasting good opinion he had already acquired. Such is the power of eloquence, when it gives utterance to truth, and comes from a heart sincere.

O'CONNELL's speech in the House of Commons on the subject of Negro Slavery, though of a different character, was equally effective. He told some most heart-rending stories of the Negro's sufferings—one in particular we cannot avoid transcribing:—

“The slave, HENRY WILLIAMS, was convicted, in his owner's mind, of attending an Independent meeting-house, and he was punished by thirty-nine articles—(Immense laughter followed this sally.) He (Mr. O'CONNELL resuming) had been happy and unhappy in his mistake; he meant thirty-nine lashes were inflicted upon this human being, because he attended an establishment not countenanced by that which countenanced the thirty-nine articles. Well, he was laid down, tied fast and lashed; and his sister, with true fraternal affection, sighed to see a man, her brother, thus degraded. Her sigh reached the ear of the planter, her owner; and he instantly exercised the power of brute force with which he was endowed, and exposed her naked back to the same number of lashes. Did any one ask for proofs?—Let him refer them to Lord GODERICH's despatch. There the circumstances were stated, and from that official document were his arguments drawn.”

Mr. O'CONNELL concluded this remarkable speech thus:—

“Let this Legislature avoid the example of the hypocrites of the free and liberal country of America, who retained the property in slaves, when they in their own manifesto, put at its head, when in rebellion against this country, the famous maxim—‘That all men were born

equal and free.' Let us hear," said he, "no more of breeding farms for slaves, on one hand, with their consignment to early graves by a disgraceful policy on the other; but let us, even across the wide Atlantic, pour into the ear of the miscreant American slave-owner, that we scorn his hypocritical example, and will not debase ourselves, by being the friends of this foul crime against man, and against the Almighty. Regardless of consequences, let us be 'just and fear not.'"

The conduct of the Americans, in respect to slavery, was a source of pain to O'CONNELL. In America, there existed great sympathy for Ireland; and his gratitude was deep. Still this dark spot, on the American escutcheon, was ever before his eyes. Though he tried to disguise it, he never liked the American character—and when the Philadelphia riots occurred, and places of worship frequented by the Catholic Irish, were burned, he no longer concealed his change of opinion.—He saw that the hypocrisy of the celebrated American manifesto, was not illustrated alone by the existence of slavery, but also by the intolerance and cruelty exhibited towards the Irish and their religion. In his younger days, he was enthusiastic in favour of the institutions of the United States. From his very childhood, he imbibed a love and respect for the American people. He was born when they struggled with England for independence—"the next parish" in Europe to New York, was that where his uncle resided. Ship after ship, as they passed on their course to or from America, or lingered lazily in the calm, reminded him of the contest for independence and for the liberty they won. The daring crew of the American smuggler, often landed on the coast, hard by; and showed by their fearlessness the spirit which freedom had engendered. He read the history of American vicissitudes and triumphs with eager attention. One day, before

he went to France, he was reading in the drawing-room of his father's house, earnestly absorbed in a book.—Dinner was announced, but young DANIEL still continued fixed on the volume. His mother went to him, and insisted on his giving up reading and coming to dinner. "What book," she afterwards asked him—"what book were you reading, DANIEL?" "I was learning a lesson, I will get profit by, mother—I was reading RAMSAY'S "History of the American War." These early impressions in favour of America were, as we have stated, greatly altered in subsequent years. He must, however, before he died—if he heard of it, have been gratified with the noble conduct of the State of New England, in not only subscribing large sums to assist the perishing poor of Ireland, but in actually sending vessels with the produce of these subscriptions. And this by Americans alone, without any aid from the Irish, who subscribed separately and generously; and in many cases sent their whole savings from years of toil to their relatives in this country. And this, too, by persons differing widely from the Catholics in their religious faith. It was the most glorious instance of national sympathy and benevolence on record. It must, if he was aware of it, have delighted the LIBERATOR in his last days.

We now approach a subject of much interest, and which made no little noise at the time;—namely, the difference between O'CONNELL and the majority of the Irish Repeal members, on the propriety of discussing in that session of Parliament, the Repeal of the Act of Union. Public opinion, guided it is true by subsequent experience of the result, has long since pronounced against the premature introduction of the Repeal Question to Parliament. For its fate in 1834, threw a damper on the agitation, from which it did not recover for nine years afterwards. But we should endeavour to look at the subject according to the

lights of 1833, in order to do justice to the views of both sides. At a meeting of the Irish Repeal members, or, as they were baptised by the *Evening Mail*—"O'CONNELL's tail," a name which, while testifying to his influence, was intended as a stigma on the independent character of the Irish Representative—a discussion occurred which clearly proves that they followed O'CONNELL generally because he was right; when they considered him wrong they went against him. He was then Leader, and they looked to him, because of his commanding position in Ireland and in the House of Commons. They gave him implicitly their confidence, as the head of their party, the exponent of their principles. There was nothing derogatory in this. They had, therefore, reason to be annoyed at such a name one that has become immortal.—

To return. At the Meeting of the Irish Repeal Members, O'CONNELL stated his reasons for not pressing on the discussion of their Question that Session. In the first place, their speeches would be all "burked" by the Press; while those in favor of the Union, would be given at full length. The subsequent conduct of the Press to O'CONNELL justified this conjecture. In the next place, the Irish people, during the continuance of the Coercion Act, could not express their opinion on the subject—they could not even petition in its favor; and, lastly, the inevitable defeat of the motion would tend to the popularity of the Ministry in England. It would be but giving a triumph to their enemies. On the other hand, it was urged that the arguments used by Mr. O'CONNELL would tell as much against discussion any other year as at that time. Defeat would be the result for years. But by the force of constant annual discussion, in the teeth of the most adverse circumstances, their cause, which was founded on Justice and Truth, must triumph. This was

the case with Catholic Emancipation—with slavery abolition, and with every great Reform, in a free country like England, where difference of opinion is at the same time the result and the agent of civil liberty. Judging of the arguments on both sides, we would be inclined to say, that the doctrine of the party led on by FERGUS O'CONNOR was right. But, taking expediency and prudence as elements of the discussion, we should go with O'CONNELL. A division was come to at the meeting, and the numbers for postponement were TWELVE—for immediate discussion, TEN. O'CONNELL'S OWN immediate family formed a large portion of the TWELVE.—Therefore, outside of them, there was at this first meeting a majority of the Repeal Members for discussion. There were thirty-two at the meeting, and but twenty-two voted. Postponement being agreed upon, O'CONNELL immediately put the following notice on the books of the House of Commons:—

“ That on the very earliest day possible in, the next
 “ session, he should move a resolution declaratory of
 “ the means by which the *destitution* of the Irish Parlia-
 “ ment was effected—of the miseries which the measure
 “ called the Legislative Union has produced in Ireland—
 “ of the evils which it has inflicted on the agricultural
 “ labourers and operatives in manufactures in England—
 “ of the accumulating pressure of the poor laws which
 “ it has created in England, and of the inevitable sepa-
 “ ration of both countries, which must result from con-
 “ tinuing the Union as at present arranged and acted
 “ upon. And also for leave to bring in a Bill, to render
 “ safe, secure, and permanent, the connexion between
 “ Great Britain and Ireland, by the means of the re-
 “ establishment of a Domestic Legislature in Ireland.”

This question of Postponement, or No Postponement, caused very considerable difference of opinion in Ireland.

The *Freeman's Journal* led the way in favor of immediate discussion, and in a series of able articles, enforced strongly and eloquently its imperative necessity. This Journal replied to Mr. O'CONNELL's arguments, and showed that if he raised in 1832, the standard of Repeal, because of a defect in the Reform Act—there was ten times more reason now when a Coercion Bill was passed. The *Pilot* took the opposite ground, and denounced immediate discussion as most injurious to the national cause; and, called it a desperate experiment. The Provincial Repeal Press took opposite sides, and a very angry spirit was exhibiting itself amongst the people.

The rival parties appealed to the public. Mr. O'CONNELL addressed to a friend in Dublin, a letter from which the following extract was given to the public:—

“ I know that any rational discussion of the all-important question of Repeal, is impossible in this advanced and complicated state of the public business. We should have been either deprived of a House by members going away, or we should be treated with contempt and ridicule, by men who are now thinking of nothing save *escaping* from London and getting rid of the session. You have no idea of the effects which must be produced in this country as well as in Ireland, by the total and ludicrous failure of the attempt to discuss it *now*. It would literally be equal only to the plan of “privateering after the war.”

“ I have given my notices for the FIRST day of the next session. I will bring them on the next thing after the KING's speech shall be discussed. Every day, up to that period, will add to my materials for introducing the great regenerating measure with proper effect.

“ I will begin my “ letters to the *True Sun*,” again in the next week. It is necessary I should show the Irish people my reasons in detail, for objecting to discussion

in the present Session, while I commence my operations, to be prepared for the ensuing one ; when the Repeal campaign shall be opened with a vigour commensurate with the object to be struggled for.

“ Every day’s experience convinces me that, by a little perseverance, we shall achieve the Repeal, as the people did the Catholic Question, and are now achieving the *actual* abolition of tithes ; the first step to which was taken on Wednesday night.

“ One great reason why I would not bring on the Repeal this Session is, that it would give a fictitious patriotism to men who have been voting badly through three-fourths of the Session ; and, indeed, it is just such men who, *in general*, are forcing it on at present. Only think of men who have supported the present Algerine Ministry, against the people of England, on questions of taxation, *working up* their popularity by giving a vote for Repeal, just at the moment when no rational result could ensue—for the idea of bringing in a Repeal Bill at this time of the Session, is quite ridiculous, even if there were a majority in its favour.”

Mr. FERGUS O’CONNOR, on his part, addressed to his constituency of the County of Cork, the following letter :

“ GENTLEMEN—When we lately succeeded in what was, then, called the noble struggle for Independence, the Empire was full of surprise, at the stand made by the heretofore corrupt County of Cork.

“ I am now your Representative ; but I did not give one pledge to gain a single vote. I placed before you my principles ; I did not ask an individual to vote for me ; nay, I prevented many from doing so ; and I did not ask any person to propose or to second me. My advice to you, upon all occasions, was, not to promise support to any individual, until the time had arrived, when men

should have an opportunity of investigating the claims of each candidate for your support.

“ You must recollect the resounding cheers which always followed the mention of Repeal.—I recollect the sacrifices which you made to add one to the list of the advocates of that measure. I was not a political tactician. I expressed my sentiments undisguisedly. I made my pledges solemnly, in presence of the noble Freeholders of the County ; and the brave, the manly, the unflinching trades of the City. When I had pledged myself to particular measures, the impression upon my mind was, that I should seize the first opportunity which offered for redeeming those pledges. We deprecated the Moderates as “ Wait-a-whiles ;” we looked upon the moment as having arrived, when all Ireland should cry aloud for liberty. If you put any other than the straight-forward meaning upon the pledge ;—if you meant to incur it with time, and place, and incident, and all the little dove-tailed minutiae of electioneering trickery ; such as—the time has not arrived—the question is not ripe in Ireland—St. Stephen’s is not the place to discuss it just now—circumstances are against us at this moment, for reasons which I can’t explain—the whole machinery is not yet complete.—Now, if such are your views, I am not a fit and proper person to represent your sentiments. As long as the same spirit, the same principles, and the same sentiments regulate our conduct, I am your political servant ; but I would not hold the office one moment, at the expense of the compromise of one particle of my principles.

“ I have given you time to speak out. Speak to me as you would speak of me—without reserve. Censorship alone can make your representatives honest.

“ Now, I shall tell you my course. From the torments

which I have endured since this question of Repeal was first mooted, I have been unavoidably obliged to postpone my motion, from the 26th June, to the 16th July. It can scarcely be said that I do this upon my own responsibility. I am fortified by the support of many honest Repealers, by the independent Press, and the glorious People of Ireland. Then, on the 16th, we go to the battle. Our Great General will not lead the little band to the fight.—I WILL. If our defeat is more signal, I am not to blame, I should rather bring up the re-re; but the battle must be fought. Of course we shall be beaten. After our defeat, I shall return to you, and put one of my pledges into execution—I mean annual choice of your Representatives. I shall tender my resignation. This will be the proper course, and shall continue to do so at the end of every Session, as long as I have the honor of being your Representative. I think, sinking all others, this would be the most efficient pledge to put to Candidates. It would amount to Annual Parliaments; and, as I think a Representative should possess the confidence of the entire Constituency, I should say that an application from one-fourth of those who voted for him, should be considered as sufficient to command his resignation.

“ I do not mean to have any secrets from my constituents; I therefore think it right to inform you, that I am the more anxious for an expression of public opinion from Cork, in consequence of an assurance from Mr. GARRETT STANDISH BARRY, that he had received directions from his constituents to be entirely guided by Mr. O'CONNELL. If such is the determination that our constituents have come to, in fairness, I should be informed of it. I think I deserve to know the sentiments of all men and all public bodies upon this question, for I have dealt fairly and openly with the public. I believe that few men would,

under all the circumstances, have remained inflexible upon the resolution which I come to, of having a discussion this Session upon the subject. I now call for an expression of public opinion from Cork, upon the subject of immediate discussion upon the Repeal of the Union.

“ I have the honor to remain,

“ Your faithful Servant,

“ FEARGUS O'CONNOR.

“ 4, Bridge-street, Westminster, June 22, 1833.

“ P.S.—I cannot omit this opportunity of congratulating the People of Ireland, upon the manly and unvarying support which the cause nearest their heart has received from the independent *Freeman's Journal*, and the other Patriotic Papers which have taken up this question. You should insist upon all your Repealers—all other business being laid aside—being at their post on the 16th.”

· Mr. O'CONNELL, on his part wrote the following letter to the Editor of the *Pilot*.

“ London, 24th June, 1833. . . .

“ MY DEAR BARRETT—I am so assailed by that part of the press which is virulently opposed to Repeal; and also by some of the Repealers, that I snatch a moment from my other duties to set myself right, on one matter of fact. Perhaps it is useless, when the spirit of misrepresentation is abroad; but I will put the falsehood upon record, for the contentment of my own mind.

“ It has been asserted and reasserted, that at the meeting of Irish members, to consider the propriety of bringing on a discussion of “the Repeal” before the close of the present season, *I had insisted on, and succeeded in, excluding from voting every man, save a pledged Repealer.*” Now, this assertion is not only false, but is just diametrically contrary to the truth; for the truth is, I insisted that every Irish member should vote, who thought that the

conduct of the present Parliament ought to *influence him to support* the Repeal, although not pledged to that measure. Mr. O'CONNOR, however, succeeded against me on that point, and persuaded no less than seven or eight who declared their opinions favourable to my plan of postponing discussion until next Session, to refrain from voting.

“ I do not say which of us was right—I only state the fact.

“ I now disembarass my mind of this part of the matter altogether. I wish I had leisure to develop all my reasons for postponement—that is, my plan for carrying the Repeal. I will do so as soon as I possibly can. If I am permitted to arrange that plan, I think it must be successful. I am quite sure that if I were on the spot in Ireland, there is not one honest Repealer who would not join me in the arrangement, when I had time and opportunity to explain its details, to point out its efficacy, and to show the fatuity of exposing our great and sacred cause to derision and ridicule.

“ Believe me always yours most truly,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

Then came his letter in the *Freeman*, which disposed of the controversy, and produced a second meeting of the Repeal Members, at which “ POSTPONEMENT” was carried by a large majority; several members declaring they were converted to that policy by the LIBERATOR'S letter. Speaking afterwards, in 1840, of the hot-headed introduction to Parliament of the Repeal Question, he said, “ In the last agitation for Repeal, we were forced to bring the question before Parliament prematurely, and against my own conviction of the utility of doing so. I conceived at the time that another year ought to have been allowed to pass; but we were driven on by enthusiasts and a portion of the press; and I now confess I

yielded against my own conviction to their entreaties. The consequence was, as I had foreseen, a fatal blow to the question itself, at least for a considerable time. It was principally urged on by a newspaper which has been always remarkably conspicuous for its advocacy of Repeal; I mean the *Freeman's Journal*—than which paper none better deserves the esteem and gratitude of Repealers. Of the evening papers, the *Pilot* is our firm advocate. The *Freeman*, however, is the only morning paper which advocates Repeal; and no evening paper can exceed it in its strong and able advocacy of that measure. In speaking thus of the *Freeman*, I mean not to disparage the *Pilot* in the slightest degree, nor the talents and patriotism of my friend, Mr. BARRETT. In 1833, we were induced to bring forward the measure prematurely. I have since considered that a fault."

In taking leave of this part of our history, we may be permitted to say, that however much we differ from the proceedings of Mr. FERGUS O'CONNOR in late years, we at this period considered him, and still consider him, an honest, straight-forward man—gifted with great energy and great powers as a popular orator. He opened the Representation of the County of Cork to popular Candidates—he broke down in the Yorkshire of Ireland the influence of the Aristocracy, and during the Tithe Agitation, he did good service to his country. We are bound, by a principle of justice, to say this much of his character and conduct. About the time this division amongst the Repealers occurred, a very unpleasant contention arose between Mr. O'CONNELL and the Reporters of the London Press. O'CONNELL had clear reason to complain, though we don't approve of the mode in which he conveyed his sense of the injustice done him. He undoubtedly was eminent in the House of Commons. He might truly be called the Representative of millions, for he possessed the unbounded

confidence of an entire people. It was, therefore, due to him that what he said in Parliament should meet the public eye. If Reporters were, *sub rosa*, permitted to enter the House of Commons, in defiance of its standing orders, it was always with the understanding that the speakers should be done equal justice to, according to their *public* importance. No private resentment should influence the reports. But, on the other hand, it being borne in mind, that newspapers, for the most part, are mercantile speculations, and that when a person subscribes, he expects to be presented with acceptable matter—the publisher will use his discretion and consult his interest in the selection of speeches for insertion. If it be his interest—and his and the interests of his readers are identical, there is no doubt that speeches will be reported in full. If, however, every hour consumed in speaking occupies three columns of a paper, and that at least seven hours are, night after night, so consumed in Parliament, it is plain that if every speaker were given at length, twenty-one columns of the paper would be filled. A selection must therefore be made. The London Journals, at that period, thought it their interest to report at length the Ministers and popular English members; and as they had but a certain space to devote to Parliamentary debates—having given in full the speeches required by their readers, they were obliged to curtail the remainder. Amongst the rest, very injudiciously in our opinion, O'CONNELL'S were abridged; particularly on the West India Slavery question, on which he spoke so eloquently, and on which his speeches would have been read with deep and lasting interest. O'CONNELL felt mortified at this. He had, as observed before, created the reporting staff in Ireland; every word he there uttered was recorded; and he could not brook the indiffe-

rence with which he considered himself treated by the Stenographic Corps of England. Accordingly, at a meeting assembled at the Globe Hotel, for the purpose of taking steps to create a testimonial to Major CARTWRIGHT, he is reported to have made use of the following words :—

“ But why did he talk of newspapers?—it was all vain for the public to expect from newspapers, as they were then constituted and managed, any thing like honesty.—No; they would have nothing but the distillation of individual malignity, and the concentration of private hate, through those foul mediums. What did the newspapers do but evil? People might talk of them as they liked; but he maintained that, constituted and managed as they were, they did nothing but evil. Such atrocious proceedings on the part of the newspaper press were unparalleled. It was in vain to think that they would grow better. The *Times*, the mighty *Times*, had during all that period, the worst reports of these proceedings; the very worst, because they were designedly bad. The *Chronicle*, once the friend of the people—now how fallen—had them equally bad, because with the same intentions. But both were in the hands of Ministers, and that fully explained the matter. Complaints were making daily and hourly by Members of Parliament, of the infamous reports of their sentiments which appeared in the Morning Papers; private complaints, he admitted. Perhaps they had their own reasons for not making them public, but he had none. He knew well that there was no enemy more feared by a public man than a newspaper; but he was not afraid of them at all; he defied their utmost power and ingenuity.”

Now, it is notorious that the reports of public meetings and of the House of Commons are given on the authority of the

persons employed for that duty. The Newspaper Editors don't interfere, and it is a point of honor with the professional Reporter to be as faithful as his abilities will admit. —No hostile political feeling will have influence, except with a mean, corrupt mind. No editor or proprietor of a paper dare interfere with the reports of an honest man, except in measuring the space available for their insertion. O'CONNELL then, in our opinion, was not justified in using the language he did towards the professional reporters ; though, we think on public, as well as private grounds, he did right, and showed great moral courage in resisting the attempt of the London Press, to withhold his sentiments from the public. Such being to our mind, the general principles which should govern the consideration of this question, we proceed to narrate what occurred— After the speech of Mr. O'CONNELL, from which we have given an extract, the following document appeared in the *Times* Newspaper :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

“ SIR,—We the undersigned Parliamentary Reporters of your Paper, beg to inform you, that without any wish to prejudice the interests of the establishment with which many of us have been long connected, and to which all of us are sincerely attached, we have deliberately resolved not to report any speech of Mr. O'CONNELL's until he shall have retracted, as publicly as he made, the calumnious assertion that our reports are ‘ designedly false.’ We are ready and willing to take upon ourselves personally all the consequences with which the House of Commons may think fit to visit this our determination.

“ Respect for our own characters has dictated this resolution ; and be the consequences, to us, what they may, we will abide by it.

“ We beg, as an act of justice to us, that you will publish this our declaration.

“ We are your’s, obediently,

J. D. WOODS,

JOHN TYAS,

GEORGE FISHER,

JAMES SHERIDAN,

RICHD. M. BOUSFIELD,

CHAS. ROSS,

E. NUGENT,

MICHAEL NUGENT,

JOHN ROSS.

THOS. THORNTON,

FRANCIS ROSS,

Times Office, July 25.

Upon this document making its appearance, Mr. O’CONNELL, in his place in Parliament, moved that the Printer of the *Times* be brought to the bar. In vindication of his own course he stated—“that it was because he hated
“despotism that he was determined to persevere until
“the present privileges of the House were so ludicrous
“that no one would henceforward talk of the dignity of
“the House; that the Reporters boasted that they had
“succeeded in putting down some of the greatest men
“the country had produced; that they had overcome a
“member of the present Administration—nay, that they
“had overcome the LORD CHANCELLOR himself, and
“they added to the list the names of TIERNEY and
“WYNDHAM, the last of whom had conciliated them by
“a dinner. But they should not put him down, and that
“they would find.”

In reply to Mr. O’CONNELL—Mr. D. W. HARVEY spoke—He was considered one of the most eloquent men then in the House of Commons. His speech is so truly graphic that it is worth giving at some length.

He said—“The subject was two-fold, it was personal, and it was public. The personal part of it might be referred to any gentleman in the House—the Hon. Baronet who spoke last, for instance. He agreed that it would be impossible to report verbatim—and he was confident that

if all that was said appeared every morning, the Reporters would be accused of too oppressive fidelity (Hear, hear). He once asked how this happened; and he was asked in reply—do you think we should write ourselves down; if we wrote a fourth of the nonsense spoken in your House, we should write ourselves out of existence—(A laugh). The hon. member for Sheffield had, at the commencement of the Session, suggested that no member should be permitted to speak longer than a quarter of an hour—a suggestion in which he thought there was much good sense. He should recommend that it be left to the fourth Estate, and to the Speaker, to devise some plan for carrying it into effect; and thus they might, perhaps, correct the despotism which was complained of. They would at once relieve any particular member from the imputation of not having spoken long enough—(A laugh),—when he had fulfilled the prescribed measure of a quarter of an hour. If the members would do that, they should stand better in the public estimation—(A laugh)—they should be thought better of by the Reporters—(laughter)—and he was sure they should have better reason to be pleased, when they saw their speeches the next morning in the papers—(Laughter.) I should, therefore, recommend (said the hon. member) that you, Sir, should have an hour glass by the side of your chair, or rather a glass for a quarter of an hour (Hear and laughter) on one side of your chair, and a bell on the other; that when the quarter of an hour had elapsed by your glass, you should touch your bell; and then if the papers contained a similar memorial to that inserted now, when the hour of three o'clock comes, and when the Speaker is said on that account to leave the Chair—no matter what may be the importance of the subject—why then, Sir, when any Hon. Member was in the highest flights of his oratorical

fancy, he would at once be let down, on the assurance that his sand had run out. (Bursts of laughter.) These are the considerations that strike my mind on the subject now immediately before us. As far as the principle of the matter is concerned, I should beg leave to offer a suggestion, which I trust will not be the less acceptable because it is novel. I have no doubt that my Honourable and Learned Friend thinks he has cause to complain: he says (so we understood the Honourable Member; but the constant and lively mirth which the Honourable Member's speech, and its humorous delivery occasioned, prevented us from being positive); "Let me have a hearing—give me a Committee, and I will show that I have been misrepresented." If so, why let him have his Committee, and the matter will drop there. If the charge is made out, Mr. NUGENT will not stand quite as well as I could wish; and we may send our compliments to Mrs. BRODIE, and say that her gentleman—(loud laughter)—has not conducted himself as he ought (continued laughter). His connexion with the House; that is, his connexion with the paper, would cease. Though, I think, Sir, that this question, as a personal question, ought to be thus got rid of; yet, with respect to the other part of the question, I think we should, adverting to our own character, preserve that character more pure, and add to the dignity of our deliberations if we could get rid of our habit of talking—(hear, hear)—and confine ourselves to the substance, and length will then be no longer the test of merit. Now, however, it is so, for whenever an hon. gentleman is speaking on a particular subject, and I am coming down to the house and meet some honourable gentlemen coming up from it, and I ask who is speaking, and how?—the answer often is—"Oh, pretty well—he has only been speaking forty

minutes" (loud laughter). The length of a speech is now the test of its excellence. I do not think it ought to be: In my mind he is the greatest man who is able to put the greatest number of facts in the fewest words, and occupy the house for the shortest time (hear, and cheers). If that was the case with us, I think we should show our good sense more than we do now, and we should not have reason to be alarmed with the prospect of the session lasting till September (loud and long continued laughter and cheering)."

Mr. O'CONNELL'S motion was lost by a majority of one hundred and fifty-three to forty-eight. The London Morning Papers took advantage of this division to retrace their steps. Having had, as they called it, a triumph, the Reporters published a most hostile letter against O'CONNELL, stating, however, that having vindicated themselves, and having, as they thought, the sanction of the House of Commons, they would report Mr. O'CONNELL, as they would any other person. This concession was extorted from them by the determination of Mr. O'CONNELL to use his privileges, under the standing orders, and to have all strangers excluded. We have on this transaction, stated our opinion as to the charge of Mr. O'CONNELL on the Reporters. In that we think he was wrong. We think the Reporters equally wrong in allowing their private quarrel to interfere with their public duty. Mr. O'CONNELL, in Parliament, on public grounds, was entitled to the circulation of his views. There was no doubt that, ultimately, the force of public opinion would oblige the papers to provide correct reports of the sentiments of so distinguished a man. Reporters are more or less public servants, and to that public the gentlemen attached to the *Times* were bound to give the fullest information; particularly regarding a man who had then under his guidance, thirty-nine

members of Parliament ; and who was the Representative of at least seven millions of people.

MR. O'CONNELL, in the month of August, retired to Darrynane Abbey, and soon after addressed his constituents a series of letters, challenging investigation into his conduct as their representative, and detailing succinctly the different measures which were submitted to the Legislature, and the course he adopted on each. Of his superhuman efforts against the Coercion Bill, of his exertions in favor of the principle of Parliamentary interference with Church property—of his zeal in the cause of Negro freedom, of his attention generally to his Parliamentary duties, there was no second opinion. From him no vindication was required. But the letters were of considerable importance as public documents, from his masterly views of the different measures, and from the clear condensed history he gave of the Session which had terminated.

Another change of consequence, in the executive Government of Ireland, occurred about this period. The Marquess of WELLESLEY replaced the Marquess of ANGLESEY. He came over with the full benefit of experience, and the determination to conciliate—to heal, if possible, the wounds which a hot headed Secretary, and a weak, though well intentioned Viceroy, had, during the last three years, inflicted. He was assisted by Mr. LITTLETON, who was, undoubtedly, a well intentioned, though by no means an able man. Lord WELLESLEY was advanced in life ; but his intellect was as lofty and generous as ever. But he came to govern Ireland at a peculiar crisis ; when it was difficult for an English Viceroy, anxious to maintain the Union, to give satisfaction to the People. To his short government of Ireland we shall have occasion to recur. He was married to a Roman Catholic—an American lady (Miss CATON) Granddaughter

to the celebrated CAROL of Carolton ; one of these who, throwing off allegiance to England, signed the document by means of which America won her independence. He was exceedingly popular in Dublin—most charitable—and affable. The Marchioness's amiability and charity, during her stay in the Irish Capital, is of political interest ; for it tended to smother some of the discontent Government had to encounter, and it secured for Lord WELLESLEY additional respect from the Catholics.

About this time, rumours were again afloat respecting the acceptance of office by Mr. O'CONNELL. They were set at rest by the following, which appeared in the *Dublin Pilot* :—

“ We lately unequivocally contradicted the report of Mr. O'CONNELL's being about to accept office. We did so then from internal evidence, founded upon an intimate knowledge of Mr. O'CONNELL's sentiments. We had since a private letter from the LIBERATOR, in which he says, in substance :—

“ I authorise you to contradict positively the report of my acceptance of office. I scarcely can foresee any possible circumstances which would induce me to take office, until Ireland has her own Legislature ; until then I wish to be the unplaced advocate of the *people* of Ireland.”

An extract from a private letter of the LIBERATOR's, at this very time, with reference to these statements, will not be inappropriately quoted here. The letter was dated from London, and ran thus :

* * * * *

“ The Ministry have made, and are making, more direct offers to me—also putting out of the way those with whom I could not, and would not act ; but all this does not make me one whit the less immovable. If I went into office, I should be their servant ; that is, their slave. By staying out of office, I am, to a consi-

“derable extent, their master. STANLEY was on this
 “account removed from Ireland. Lord ANGLESEY is
 “now obliged to retire—and it is intended that BLACK-
 “BURNE be put on the shelf. But all this relates to men
 “—what I want are measures. In the three hours
 “dialogue I had with a member of the Government, Lord
 “ANGLESEY, some time back, my constant reply to
 “every approach to my own interest was—what do you
 “intend to do for Ireland? The answer was—Every-
 “thing. Now, everything means—Nothing, and indeed
 “demonstration since has proved it. Without taking
 “office, I shall be able to get,

“FIRST—A number of bad Magistrates removed.

“SECONDLY—The Yeomanry disarmed.

“THIRDLY—Tithes abolished.

“FOURTHLY—The establishment of the Protestant
 “Church reduced in every parish where the overwhelm-
 “ing majority are Catholics or Dissenters.

“FIFTHLY—I shall have offices filled with Liberals,
 “to the exclusion of Orangeists.

“These are great things, and instead of soliciting
 “some of them, as I should do were I in office, I will
 “command them when out of office. Add to these, the
 “redress of Corporate abuses, and you will see that
 “prospects advance for the Irish people. I must keep
 “out of office, too, to be disengaged to forward the
 “movement, instead of being a clog on the wheel which
 “I should be were I in office. Then, lastly, but first in
 “order of magnitude, is the Repeal of the Union. We
 “never can thrive without Repeal. Nothing prevents
 “the force of the cry for Repeal becoming irresistible
 “but the remaining hopes of the revival of the ascen-
 “dency party. All the measures I speak of, and espe-
 “cially Corporate Reform, would be brain blows to
 “that faction. Wait a while, and I think you will see

“ the strongest Repealers amongst us of that party.
 “ They will be bitter; we are merely determined.

* * * * *

“ But may not the Repeal be dispensed with, if we get
 “ beneficial measures without it? This is a serious ques-
 “ tion, and one upon which good men may well differ;
 “ but it is my duty to make up my mind upon it, and I
 “ have made up my mind accordingly, that there can be
 “ no safety, no permanent prosperity for Ireland, with-
 “ out a Repeal of the Union. *This is my firm, my unal-*
 “ *terable conviction.*”

The officials about the Castle were, however, at last, become civil to the great Irishman; and Mr. LITTLETON actually had the hardihood to ask the LIBERATOR to dinner, and O'CONNELL actually dined with the Irish Secretary. The time had not yet arrived when he was to be the guest of the Viceroy. The hospitalities of the CASTLE had not yet been expanded. The civility of Mr. LITTLETON to the Repeal agitator caused some sensation, and some quires of foolscap were consumed in discussing whether or not he did really dine with the Secretary.

On his way to Darrynane, it was the determination of the Citizens of Cork, to invite him to a public dinner, and an invitation to that effect was forwarded. But he went to his mountain home through Limerick, and the following reply, addressed to the Chairman of a meeting assembled to forward the invitation, was dated—

“ Darrynane Abbey, 3rd Sept., 1833.

“ MY DEAR FAGAN—I beg leave respectfully to acknowledge the invitation to a public dinner, which a meeting of the Citizens of Cork have done me the honour to transmit to me through you, their Chairman.

“ If any thing could enhance the value of such a com-

pliment, it is the channel through which it has been communicated.

“ But, in plain truth, nothing can increase in my mind its importance. I receive that invitation, not only with pride and pleasure, but with sentiments of, I trust, a more exalted and patriotic nature.

“ I accept it as a proof that the patriotic and independent citizens of Cork, sympathise with me in the exertions that I have humbly, but zealously made, not only to advance the best interests of our native land, but also to protect her from the wanton and unnatural injury and debasement of being deprived of the first and greatest of all constitutional rights, at the atrocious caprice of the mock reformers—ministerial and legislative.

“ Your invitation proves that you concur with me in the just and inextinguishable indignation that every lover of liberty and of Ireland, must feel at this, the greatest, and I trust the last, outrage that has been perpetrated upon unhappy Ireland by the insolence of British power, combined with British falsehood and folly. The shouts of barbaric domination with which the Coercion bill was cheered, still ring in my ears, and enliven my determination to render a repetition of such a scene impossible—by that which alone can secure the liberty of Irishmen and the constitutional connexion of the two countries—**THE RESTORATION OF OUR DOMESTIC LEGISLATURE !**

“ I accept, therefore, your invitation, containing, as it does, the evidence of your hearty concurrence with me in the deep conviction that Ireland can never expect safety for her liberties, encouragement for her commerce, the stimulant and universal advantage of a domestic market and domestic consumption for her agriculture and manufactures ; and, greater than all, free-

dom from paltry and vile insult, without a peaceable, a constitutional, but a complete, REPEAL OF THE UNION.

“ But, although I must accept your invitation, as I would obey an honoured command, yet I trust you will allow me to name a distant day for that purpose. After nearly seven months of the most close and unremitting labour, I want the calm and quiet of my loved native hills—the bracing air, purified as it comes over “ the world of waters,” the cheerful exercise, the majestic scenery of these awful mountains, whose wildest and most romantic glens are awakened by the enlivening cry of my merry beagles; whose deep notes, multiplied one million of times by the echoes, speak to my senses, as if it were the voice of magic powers commingling, as it does, with the eternal roar of the mighty Atlantic, that breaks and foams with impotent rage, at the foot of our stupendous cliffs. Oh! these are scenes to revive all the forces of natural strength—to give new energy to the human mind, to raise the thoughts above the grovelling strife of individual interests—to elevate the sense of family affection into the purest, the most refined, and the most constant love of country, and even to exalt the soul to the contemplation of the wisdom and mercy of the all-seeing and good GOD, who has been pleased to afflict Ireland with centuries of misrule and misery, but seems now to have in store for her a coming harvest of generous retribution.

“ Permit me, then, to postpone for some—shall I say considerable—time, the day on which I am to meet my friends, and the friends of Ireland, in Cork. Do not tear me from this loved spot, until I have enjoyed some of its renovating effects. If you think I deserve the sweets of this loved retreat, give me time to taste them more at leisure after my fatigues and vexations; and al-

low me to mention a distant day for that on which I am to meet you at the festive board, consecrated, in my humble name, to the welfare of Ireland.

“ Believe me, it is with regret I seek this postponement. I prize the patriotism of the Citizens of Cork as of the highest importance. There is this in your patriotism that makes it of inestimable value—namely, that it is not confined to one sect or party. You have not only patriotic Catholics, as elsewhere, but you have—what is wanted, alas ! in too many places—patriotic Protestants of several religious denominations, who rival the best friends of Ireland, in the energy, the intelligence, and the pure sincerity of their love of country.

“ Would that the Protestants of the rest of Ireland would imitate the patriotic ardour of so many highly distinguished, respectable, and religious Protestants in Cork. Then, indeed, Ireland would be too strong for oppression ; and peace, prosperity, and freedom would flourish under the protecting influence of a domestic Legislature.

“ I cannot conclude without again expressing to you my gratitude for the kind manner in which you have conveyed to me this proud invitation.

“ I have the honor to be, Sir, your very obedient faithful servant,

“ DANIEL O’CONNELL.

“ WM. FAGAN, Esq. &c. &c.”

At the suggestion of Mr. O’CONNELL, the demonstration of respect and gratitude to him, was put off to the period when he was about to leave Kerry for the Irish Metropolis. On the ensuing 20th October, the CHAIRMAN received the following private letter from O’CONNELL :—

“MY DEAR FAGAN—Are my friends in Cork still ready to honor me with a public dinner? If so, I could and would be with them on Monday, the 10th November; I should add, if that day appeared to them suitable. The truth, however, is, that matters of this kind if once allowed to *grow cool*, are difficult to be warmed again into activity. I, therefore, consult you rather as my private and kind friend, than as the Chairman. Let the matter drop if there be any indisposition to put it on its *right legs* again. If it shall go on, I hope to see the Members of the County on the occasion. BARRY is a prime good voter, and unaffectedly right on all occasions. O'CONNOR may be a little self-willed occasionally; but he is calculated to be a useful man, and I have a great regard for him. I say nothing of the City Members—they, if they approve of my course of action, ought to be *entertainers* not entertained.

“You perceive I write to you in the most perfect confidence; my movements will be guided by your reply.

“Believe me to be,

“My dear FAGAN,

“Your's most faithfully,

“DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

To this letter an immediate reply was sent, stating that the utmost anxiety existed in Cork to know when he would be there, and that the demonstration would be worthy of the Citizens and of him. Accordingly he, by return of post, named in a letter for publication, the 4th of November, and on that day the greatest public entertainment that ever before took place in Cork, was given him. There were even Members of Parliament and three hundred citizens of the first respectability present. The writer looks back with the greatest pride to that event. He was then but a young man, and to have been selected to

preside on that occasion, was a high and enduring honor. He trusts he will be forgiven the indulgence of a gratification in transcribing here his remarks in proposing O'CONNELL's health, as they convey the unaltered sentiments of his heart to the present hour :—

The CHAIRMAN—Gentlemen, after this toast, I promise you a respite. You must fill for this toast an overflowing bumper. In giving it, I know not whether I should accompany it with any remarks; and I almost think it would be prudent on my part and more satisfactory to you, if I introduced it without offering a single observation. I feel myself incompetent to do it justice? Is it necessary for me to call on you to fill an overflowing bumper to our great and distinguished Guest, DANIEL O'CONNELL? Is it necessary to make such a request of you who know him so well, who have traced his glorious career through all its stages, who have watched his political conduct from the earliest period of his appearance in public life; you who have always found him ready to devote his great capabilities to the benefit of his country, and who have never been backward in testifying your sense of the services which he has rendered the people.—Gentlemen, here he is, the “best abused man in Europe.”—And yet I ask you does he not, in spite of the efforts of a malignant and designing Press, retain and carry with him the increased regard and affections of the people?—Why is this? Surely and simply because he deserves them. If I could imagine a man with ten times the abilities, and ten times the grasp of mind which he has exhibited, if he did not possess the same honesty and rectitude of intention of which Mr. O'CONNELL has given so many striking proofs, he could not preserve, as he has done, the affections of the people of Ireland. Gentlemen, if I could require impossibilities of you, I would ask you to forget Eman-

icipation ; I would ask you to forget a whole life devoted to his country ; I would confine your attention to the last Session of Parliament ; and I would appeal to the Members of Parliament whom I see around me, who witnessed his efforts, and who by coming here have identified themselves with the best cause of the country, for a confirmation of the answer which I am sure I should receive to such an appeal. Yes, I appeal to the Members of Parliament who are here present, and I ask them, and you who have seen, through the Newspapers, the subjects which engrossed the attention of the House during the period I allude to, and I put it to you whether he has ever ceased to demand from the British Minister, those measures of amelioration which have been reluctantly doled forth to us ? It was not, however, that he demanded measures for the benefit of his own country exclusively ; he was, on all occasions, the ready advocate and fearless champion of the rights and liberties of the universal inhabitants of the globe, without distinction of clime or soil. Who was it, I ask you, that forced STANLEY from Ireland, and put ANGLESEY upon the shelf ?—Who was it that, by his ardent and spirit-stirring eloquence, awoke the feelings of the apathetic people of England, to a sense of the wrongs about to be inflicted upon Ireland ; and so affrighted the House of Commons, that some of the worst clauses in that odious measure—the Coercion Bill—were abandoned ? Was it not his giant grasp, that unnerved and wrested from the arm of the British Minister, the ready tool which was to give the last fatal blow to the liberties and independence of Ireland, and caused the deadly instrument to fall to the ground, where it now remains, a striking memorial of English injustice and Irish oppression ? Yes, it was O'CONNELL did all this. Yes, I will say it ; he is thought present : “ My tongue must utter what my heart demands.” He is indeed

an illustrious man—not illustrious by courtesy, not through birth or time, not through rank or office; because, happily for the country, he despises office. He has not been raised to a lofty pre-eminence by the blood of thousands, or the liberties of millions. No; his pre-eminence is acquired by more noble means—by endeavouring to make that country happy and prosperous which gave him birth. He will not live in the memory of posterity, as a WELLINGTON, a NAPOLEON, or a CÆSAR, the blood-stained conqueror of the battle field, whose title to fame is founded upon the number of men he has oppressed, for a country which he despised. No, Sir, you will live in the memory of posterity, as a man whose every effort was for national improvement, and every thought for the good and benefit of your country. I give, therefore, in the words of the toast, “ Our distinguished Guest, O’CONNELL; the LIBERATOR of his own country, and the eloquent assertor of universal liberty in every clime, without distinction of class, colour, or creed.”

O’CONNELL returned to Dublin, and immediately commenced by letters, at public meetings, and charity dinners, an active Repeal agitation, in which he was zealously and eloquently assisted by SHEIL. His great speech in favor of Repeal was on the trial of RICHARD BARRETT, Esq., Proprietor of the *Pilot*, for the publication, so far back as April, of a letter of Mr. O’CONNELL’S, addressed to the People of Ireland, and printed simultaneously in the *Pilot* and the London *True Sun*. The English paper was not prosecuted; the Irish Journal was. It will be recollected, that on a former occasion, O’CONNELL cautioned the *Pilot* not to publish the letter of his which then appeared in the English Paper. Mr. BARRETT followed that advice. But in April, 1833, Mr. O’CONNELL being satisfied as a lawyer, that his letter was not libellous, sent copies to both papers at the

same time. The Provincial Press also copied it. BARRETT was, however, alone visited with a prosecution. O'CONNELL defended him. From beginning to end, his speech was an argument in favor of Repeal. It was a powerful effort. Mr. BARRETT, however, was found guilty, and sentenced to be imprisoned for six months, and pay a fine of £100.

It was attempted by his enemies, at this time, to diminish the popularity and injure the character of O'CONNELL, by charging him with having allowed Mr. BARRETT to be punished for an Act of which he—the LIBERATOR—was guilty. The *Dublin Mail* took the lead in this vituperation, and charged the Government with designedly permitting O'CONNELL to escape. The articles written on the subject in that Journal, forced the Government to take proceedings for libel against it. Lord WELLESLEY's former Government was distinguished for State Prosecutions, and though he signally failed then, he did not, on his return, appear to have relinquished the unwise policy he previously followed. He may be well called the Pacifier of India; but certainly he had no signal success in pacifying Ireland. But to return to the charge against O'CONNELL. There was no foundation for it. When taunted with it in the House of Commons by STANLEY, O'CONNELL stated that he had twice offered Mr. BARRETT to declare himself the author. Mr. BARRETT, actuated by a high principle of honor and patriotism, refused. He said that O'CONNELL's communications to him largely increased his circulation, and that he did not conceive it would be right of him to accept the advantage without the responsibility. He said, moreover, that O'CONNELL's services, outside a prison, were required by the country—that though it was not in the LIBERATOR's opinion a libellous publication, still that a packed Jury would assuredly find *him* guilty. On these grounds, Mr. BARRETT

nobly determined to take the responsibility of the publication on himself, and he declined O'CONNELL'S proposal. So much for one of the thousand calumnies to which all his life he was subjected. The letter in question was published at the time in the Dublin and London Papers. It is an error to suppose it was copied by the *Pilot* from the London *True Sun*. Mr. O'CONNELL'S subsequent increasing and invaluable services to Mr. BARRETT, prove how deeply he felt that any letter written by him should have involved the *Pilot* in a prosecution.

Some time in October, in this year, Mr. HILL, who was Member for Hull, was entertained by his Constituents. At that dinner, speaking of the Coercion Bill, which he supported, he said that a person connected with the Ministry, told him that an Irish Repeal member, who not only voted, but spoke against the bill, was privately in favour of it, and stated that there would be no living in Ireland without its protection. The words used by Mr. HILL were—

“It is impossible for those not actually in the house, to know all the secret machinery by which votes are obtained. I happen to know this (and I could appeal, if necessary, to a person well known and much respected by yourselves), that an Irish Member, who spoke with great violence against every part of that bill, and voted against every clause of it, went to Ministers and said, ‘Don't bate one single atom of that bill, or it will be impossible for any man to live in Ireland.’ ‘What,’ said they, ‘this from you who speak and vote against the bill?’ ‘Yes,’ he replied, ‘that is necessary, because if I don't come into Parliament for Ireland, I must be out altogether, and that I don't choose.’”

WHO IS THE TRAITOR? was at once the popular inquiry. Mr. HILL refused to mention names; but he said

he would answer privately—YES or NO—to any member who applied to him. Accordingly, nearly all the Irish Liberal Members addressed him. O'CONNELL refused to do so—he spurned the charge. SHEIL denied it scornfully, but did not write to Mr. HILL. It soon got out that SHEIL was the “traitor.” So this unpleasant matter rested, until the next session of Parliament, when we will find it brought formally under the consideration of the House by O'CONNELL.

The LIBERATOR's uncle, Count O'CONNELL, died this year. By his death, O'CONNELL acquired considerable personal property. There was published in the papers of the day, a very lengthened memoir of Count O'CONNELL, which it was supposed came from the LIBERATOR's pen. It would, however, not be in place to introduce it in this publication.

Taking a rapid retrospect of the events recorded in this Chapter, which we have now brought to a close, the reader will be struck with their important character—the Repeal question ; the English and Irish Reform Acts ; the Tithe agitation ; the Coercion Bill ; and the personal collisions between O'CONNELL and STANLEY, are amongst the prominent incidents. Immediately after Emancipation, O'CONNELL, it has been seen, lost no time in directing the national attention to the Great Question on which, for years, his own mind unceasingly reflected ; and his letters from Darrynane, in 1830, will be always deemed the awakening cause of the first impulse given the agitation. The Tithe crusade prosecuted by STANLEY assisted it ; the French Revolution, and the Reform movements in England, prepared the Nation for the most extensive political changes. Then came the Coercion Act, which threw the whole of Ireland into a ferment, and prepared the people for any step which they

were told would lead to national independence. In 1833, the excitement on the Repeal question was intense; and one cannot help feeling that if its strength were fostered, while at the same time it was guided, tempered, and controlled, there might have been, before O'CONNELL'S death, some satisfactory settlement. In our humble judgment, the fate of the motion in the House of Commons, which we will have to describe in the next Chapter, was no reason why the agitation should have been suspended. O'CONNELL'S object, in the course he took, was clearly to put the English Government in the wrong. Though Repeal was firmly resisted, an Act of Parliament, without being one in form or effect, was, as it were, passed, declaring that "Justice should be done to Ireland." This was the joint resolution of KING, LORDS, and COMMONS. What more was requisite to make the resolution a statute? O'CONNELL thought, after such an expression of opinion, he was bound to try the experiment, whether justice would be done. The Agitation ceased. He was disappointed. Nothing was done for Ireland; and the cause of domestic legislation was thrown back. The return he received for his forbearance was, as will be seen, insult and contumely. STANLEY, Repeal or no Repeal, was from the commencement, the LIBERATOR'S bitterest antagonist. But when, to carry out the experiment, he acted in England, with a party, then, because of his great strength and influence, he was the object of attack by every political adventurer, and every scribe, whose ends were served by making him the mark of concocted calumnies and gross vituperation. Though the events in his career, which will form a portion of the next three Chapters, will be of deep interest, we will, after the debate of 1834, lose sight of his favorite measure of Repeal, until, in 1841, we again see taken up

with ardour the national cause ; never again, we trust, to be put aside, until the demand for domestic legislation is conceded. As bringing nearly to a close, the first period in the Repeal agitation, the events in this Chapter must ever be considered as one of the most interesting portions of O'CONNELL'S history.

CHAPTER II.

1834---1835.

The Agitation of 1834, was cramped considerably by the Coercion Act. No Association of any kind could be formed, without at least the tacit sanction of the Government, and that sanction could not be expected in the case of the Repeal Question. An occasional public meeting, or a Charity Dinner, was the only mode of expressing and concentrating the public feeling, which could with safety be adopted, and even this, only under certain restrictions. For instance, O'CONNELL considered it prudent to charge admission money at these meetings; and at the commencement of the year, he broke up suddenly a meeting called by requisition, because the people forced their way in. He was asked whether, as they were clamorous for admission, they might not be allowed in gratuitously. "By no means," was his reply; "it is dangerous; "the result might be the issuing of a Proclamation." His conduct on this occasion shows how determined he was to resist even the popular will, when there was the slightest risk that compliance would give official or other opponents a material or dangerous advantage. The Agitation was hampered in Dublin by the difficulty of getting places to meet in. If such accommodation was

attainable, meetings by requisition could be held, in every Parish continuously; and as O'CONNELL would have attended them, they would have answered the object of a regular weekly Association. But there were no buildings for the purpose. Whenever the popular party did meet, it was in some Charity School-room, and on one occasion, in January, 1834, the lives of hundreds were in jeopardy, and might have been lost, but for the presence of mind and cool courage of O'CONNELL. The occurrence is thus described in the *Morning Register* of that day:—

“ A meeting was held yesterday, in the large room of the School-house at Rathmines, recently erected by the contributions of the parishioners, for the accommodation of the children of the poor in that district. Precautions had been previously taken to support the rafters of the apartment by placing planks perpendicularly under them. The pressure of the crowd, however, became so great while Mr. O'CONNELL was speaking, that these planks were broken across; which being observed by Mr. DENIS REDMOND, that gentleman, with much courage and discretion made his way through the throng to Mr. O'CONNELL, to whom he intimated the alarming state of matters. Mr. O'CONNELL, with that self-command which he possesses in so eminent a degree, stated to the assemblage that he had just received a communication which rendered it necessary to conclude the proceedings in the open space adjoining the School-house, and he enjoined them to proceed thither quietly and without pressing upon each other—probably from not being made aware of the cause of removal, this suggestion failed to effect its purpose. Mr. O'CONNELL thereupon, rightly judging of the coolness of the people, and his own power of controlling the “*movement*,” boldly mentioned that the building being considered unsafe, it became necessary to withdraw from it, adding that he relied upon the steadiness

and good sense of the people, to do so one by one, and he should be the last to quit the room. In obedience to his directions, the persons nearest the door began to depart in single files, and retired in so gradual a manner, that three-quarters of an hour elapsed before O'CONNELL'S turn, as the 'last man,' arrived for leaving the building. A singular exemplification this of the presence of mine which pervaded the multitude, and a new proof of the popular power of O'CONNELL, in really *trying* circumstances."

This affair suggested to Mr. O'CONNELL an application to Dr. MURRAY, to rescind the then existing "Canon of Discipline," which prevented the Catholic Chapels being used for political purposes. The application, even if formally made—was not successful. We are not disposed to admit the propriety of employing the House of God for any such purpose. During the pursuit of Catholic Emancipation, assemblages in Chapels to promote that measure were justified; for the people were then struggling against an injustice they endured because of their fidelity to God. To free religion, constitutionally, from the shackles of unjust laws, was a religious duty; and could be appropriately discharged in the House where the bondsmen worshipped; a duty which, the Faith for which they were persecuted, taught them to believe was especially sanctified by the divine sacrifice of the Altar. Chapels were, however, no places for ordinary public assemblages; and after Catholic Emancipation, the practice of meeting in them, was wisely and piously abandoned.

O'CONNELL'S great engine of agitation was the Press. Through its columns, despite the Coercion Act, he kept alive the spirit of the people. He addressed, at the commencement of this year, a second letter on Repeal to the Protestants of Ireland. His great object was, to make them converts to the necessity of Domestic Legis-

lation. In this letter, he unfolded to them his plan of an Irish Parliament. He showed them that the Irish House of Commons would be essentially Protestant; and that inasmuch as Ulster was the most populous province, there would be, on an average of the whole of Ireland, a fair proportion of Protestants returned as Representatives, exclusive of the probability that, Protestants being the great possessors of property, and having more time to devote to Parliamentary pursuits, they would be chosen by many Catholic constituencies, in preference to candidates of that faith. The letter to which we are referring, put these arguments in a clear and convincing light.—It is almost hopeless to expect a decidedly triumphant issue, until being convinced by this course of reasoning, the Protestants of Ireland admit the necessity for domestic legislation. But, unhappily, O'CONNELL'S arguments were thrown away on them. They had not sufficient confidence in his teachings. They did not give him credit for sincerity in their regard. They could never be got to rally round him. The instrument which O'CONNELL used so effectually, and to such good purpose in the earlier days of political agitation—namely, an unsparing tongue, when he had to defend himself—or brush away those who crossed his path, told against him in carrying out his plan for conciliating the Protestant party. In the Catholic agitation, it was necessary, though it was roughly done, that he should, when assailed, retaliate with double force. In those days of Protestant ascendancy, and Protestant superciliousness, it was necessary that the Catholic body should be defended by the massive Club of O'CONNELL. Well and fearlessly did he discharge the task. But when he had to conciliate those whom he had been compelled to censure and oppose, he experienced, in the ordinary instincts of human nature, an impediment to success. Men could

not forget so readily the past ; they could not confide too implicitly in their old assailant ; and they feared if they allowed themselves to be guided by him—they would be yielding to the dictatorship of a Catholic Leader. We speak now of those Protestants of the North, who were desirous of examining the question of Domestic Legislation. Unfortunately, in this point of view, while O'CONNELL was addressing such persuasive epistles to the Protestants of Ireland, he was writing bitter and sarcastic letters to individuals with whom he came politically into collision. He attacked POTLETT SCROPE vehemently ; he was in favour of Poor Laws for Ireland—Poor Laws were Mr. SCROPE's hobby, and to this day he continues to ride it. Public opinion has long since pronounced favorably on his integrity and public virtue. In the same manner, O'CONNELL attacked Lord CLONCURRY ; and judging from a letter his Lordship wrote him in 1834, he thus prevented, for years, Lord CLONCURRY's co-operation in the cause of Ireland. A milder tone of remonstrance, in such cases, may have been more effectual.—O'CONNELL felt strongly and warmly on all subjects connected with Ireland, and when he was thwarted in any policy he deemed essential for her interests, he gave on the instant unmeasured expression to his feelings. When the occasion passed, he never thought more of the matter. We heard a very intimate friend of his, and a man of distinguished position in the country, say that O'CONNELL often wondered why it was persons with whom he had been intimate, avoided him. He never recollected that he had attacked them in public ; that what he said was recorded in imperishable characters, and that sarcasm which he forgot after it was uttered, had often inflicted on the object a deep and lasting wound. He did not estimate at their just standard, the importance of any words coming from himself. There

can be no question, too, in the peculiar position he held as an anti-duellist, that he should have been more guarded. He was, however, always ready, when he found his error, to repair the injury. For instance, in the affair which excited such intense interest, and is known to some under the title of "WHO IS THE TRAITOR," when O'CONNELL discovered that Mr. HILL was justified in what he stated at Hull, he immediately, and in the handsomest and most generous manner, retracted every offensive sentiment contained in the letter he addressed to the people of Hull, to which we have before referred. This was most creditable and honorable; but it would have been more discreet, to have deferred the attack until the facts were distinctly ascertained. It was this impulsive impatience under wrong, and this too unmeasured severity, that deterred the Irish Protestants from listening as they should have done, to the irresistible arguments he clearly placed before them. With the nation at large, however, his influence, in 1834, was unbounded; and wherever a popular constituency existed, his dictum was sufficient to obtain for any candidate their unbounded—unbought support. His favor was a sure passport to St. Stephen's; and an address from him, as necessary a preliminary to an election, as the official Writ itself. Such was O'CONNELL'S position, on the eve of the celebrated Repeal debate, this year, in Parliament.

The legislature met in February, and Mr. O'CONNELL soon brought the question of WHO IS THE TRAITOR, to an issue—by asking Lord ALTHORPE whether any such communication as that described by the Member for Hull to his constituents, was actually made by an Irish Representative to any member of the Government. The statement to which this question referred we have given before. Lord ALTHORPE replied in the following words :

“ The Hon. and Learned Gentleman has put two questions to me. He has asked whether I or any other of his Majesty’s Ministers, have had a communication such as that mentioned in the extract he has just read, from an Irish Member. who had spoken violently against the coercion bill, and who had voted against it. To that question, as far as I am personally aware, I answer in the negative. With respect also to what had been stated about a secret manner employed, for obtaining votes by Ministers, I never made such a statement; and as far as I am aware, no such mode is employed; and, I believe that no Cabinet Minister ever made any such statement as that there was. I am placed in the same position as my Hon. and Learned Friend, and it is not my fault if my answer be short. Again, I repeat, that no one of the Irish Members made any such statement to me; but still I have reason to believe that more than one Irish Member who spoke violently against the coercion bill, and who voted against it, did, in private conversation, use very different language.”

The following extraordinary scene then took place.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL—I am astonished at the Noble Lord’s statement, but I think he is shrinking from my question. Why not give names ?

“ Lord ALTHORPE—I am not shrinking from the question.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL—If I have made use of the expression shrinking, I beg leave to retract that word. He thought that the question he had asked meant more, and that it required a fuller answer; otherwise he would not have made use of the word shrinking. He would now ask who told the Noble Lord what he had stated to be his belief ?

“ Lord ALTHORPE— I am answerable for what I have

said, and what I believe, and I am now ready, if I am called upon, to give up the name—otherwise I shall not.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL—Then, is it I? I call upon you in the name of every Irish Member—at least I call upon you in the name of every Irish Member present, to give that name.

“ An Hon. Member (Mr. FINN, it was understood).—And I ask the Noble Lord whether he means me?

“ Lord ALTHORPE answered that it was neither Mr. O'CONNELL nor Mr. FINN.

“ Here about half a dozen of the Irish Members rose, seemingly to put the same question, among whom was Mr. SHEIL.

“ The SPEAKER here interfered.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL—I hope the house will bear with us, and not allow our characters to be involved by preventing us from making any further inquiries.

“ Mr. SHEIL—There was another part of what the Noble Lord stated which required explanation—namely, that part in which he said, that one Irish Member, or more, had expressed in conversation, opinions on the Coercion bill different from those they had publicly expressed in that House. The Noble Lord stated that he was informed, that he would not give up the name of his informant, but would take on his own responsibility the statement on which his belief was founded. Since the name of the informant was not to be got at, he would ask the Noble Lord whether he was one of the Irish Members or more who had expressed opinions as he had said in private conversation. He asked the Noble Lord if he was one of those Irish Members?

“ Lord ALTHORPE—Yes; the Hon. and Learned Gentleman is one of them.

“ Mr. SHEIL—And I, on the other hand, and in the face of my country, and I would add—provided I be not

guilty of an expression of irreverence—in the presence of my God, declare that the individual who gave the Noble Lord such information, has belied me, and has been guilty of a scandalous calumny. However, as the Noble Lord has given an intimation, that he believes the statement, and takes on himself the responsibility of such belief, I shall of course say not a single word more.

“Mr. O’CONNELL then rose and said, that after the statement made by the Noble Lord, regarding the assertions made by the Hon. and Learned Member for Hull, he (Mr. O’CONNELL) felt it his duty thus publicly to retract the expressions made use of by him towards that Hon. and Learned Gentleman. He was further bound to say, that he was now convinced, and he had no hesitation in stating, that the Hon. and Learned Member was justified in the assertion which he had made. And if the Hon. and Learned Member required it, he (Mr. O’CONNELL) was ready to make any further private acknowledgments to him out of the House; for he was sensible that he had done him an injustice, and he was anxious to make every reparation in his power.”

Lord ALTHORPE having declared that he believed the statement against the Irish Members, having named Mr. SHEIL as one of them—and having taken upon himself the whole responsibility,—he at once put himself in the place of the informant whose name he refused to give.—A hostile meeting between him and SHEIL would have been the consequence, had not the House interfered, and committed both parties to the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, until each pledged himself not to go farther with the matter. The pledge was given, and both parties were forthwith released from custody. The next day, however, it was discovered that Lord ALTHORPE pledged himself to nothing more than to abstain from originating a hostile message; but that if sent one he decidedly would

respond to it. This revelation made it necessary for the House to go further, and both members were again committed to custody until the amplest pledges were obtained. The required undertakings were given, and both were again discharged. Thus terminated this part of the transaction. None will deny that Mr. SHEIL was badly treated. Mr. O'CONNELL did not, however, allow the matter to rest. A Committee of Inquiry was appointed on his motion.—The result was, the full acquittal of Mr. SHEIL—and the avowal on the part of Mr. HILL, that he was misinformed, and sincerely regretted what occurred. The two witnesses examined by the Committee were, Mr. WOOD and Mr. MACAULAY. Mr. WOOD stated that in the conversations he had with Mr. SHEIL, the latter always spoke against the Coercion Bill; and Mr. MACAULAY deposed that his conversation with Mr. SHEIL was before the introduction of the Coercion Bill, and therefore could not have reference to it. Thus, it appears, that Lord ALTHORPE and Mr. HILL were misinformed, and Mr. SHEIL's popularity and character needlessly endangered. The allegation was, at the time, invidiously and industriously circulated by the Press, that O'CONNELL's object, in moving for inquiry, was to damnify or extinguish SHEIL. STANLEY ungenerously insinuated that for Mr. SHEIL's reputation it was a dangerous proceeding, and was not called for. However, the result, proved the sincerity of Mr. O'CONNELL's friendship; his subsequent conduct towards Mr. SHEIL demonstrated the malice of the invidious accusation. Thus ended an unpleasant affair, which for months before was the subject of warm discussion in Ireland.

Immediately afterwards, Mr. O'CONNELL brought under the consideration of the House the conduct of Baron SMITH, as Judge; and moved for a Committee of Inquiry,

which, with the sanction of Government, was granted, after an animated debate and division. This motion was suggested to Mr. O'CONNELL'S mind, by a most extraordinary politico-judicial harangue, which the learned Baron addressed to the Dublin Grand Jury, and which we believe, he afterwards published. In his address, to use his own words, he "sounded the tocsin" against Repeal and the Repeal Agitators—against the people's right of discussion, and against the right of Parliament to discuss the conduct of the Judges. All this tirade was pronounced, when the bills of indictment to be sent to the Grand Jury had reference merely to a few burglary and petty larceny cases, and had nothing whatever to do with the political, and very little with the social condition of the country. The delivery of this harangue from the Bench of Justice was not the only charge against the learned Judge. For years before, he had become almost intolerable to Sheriffs, Jurors, Witnesses and Counsel, though not to Prisoners: for, with all his eccentricities, he was a most humane Judge; he never liked to favor a capital conviction; and there are anecdotes related of him in this respect, that prove his tenderness and humanity. But to Sheriffs, Jurors, Witnesses, and Counsel, he for years was a sad infliction. He never liked to retire to rest before four o'clock in the morning. He rose, in consequence, at a late hour. His habit was to go to Court about three or four o'clock, p.m., and frequently not until his brother Judge was returning to his lodgings, after the termination of his day's duties. He frequently sat until two o'clock in the morning. We can well imagine what an agreeable office that of High Sheriff was in those days. The Judge was, as may be supposed from his eccentricities, very testy; and the unlucky Sheriff, in addition to passing sleepless nights in attendance on his Lordship, had also to endure his pettishness of tem-

per. The course he adopted was a burlesque on the administration of Justice. That the public should for so many years have continued, at the cost of such serious inconvenience, to indulge the whims and oddities of one man, only proves how slavish was the state of society, and how governed people were by party feeling. The learned Baron was, however, a man of very high literary attainments. He was an accomplished scholar, and had some pretensions to be an orator. He was, moreover, in his younger days, a decided friend to the Catholics. This gave him a place in their affections, and induced them to pass over things of which they might have loudly complained. Mr. O'CONNELL, too, praised him highly, in the Catholic Association, on several occasions, particularly in 1827, for his liberal and impartial conduct in a case against a Roman Catholic Priest, at the trial of which he presided. Latterly, however, his political sentiments had undergone great alteration; and in addition to this, his eccentricities had increased. Under these circumstances, O'CONNELL introduced his motion, and carried it. This affair caused very great difference of opinion amongst Ministers. Sir JAMES GRAHAM and other leading members of the Government went against inquiry; Lords ALTHORPE and STANLEY were for it. Before the Parliamentary Committee assembled, Sir EDWARD KNATCHBULL moved that the inquiry be abandoned. He was supported by PEEL and all his party. The consequence was, the Government were defeated by a majority of six. This division proved that there was a screw loose in the Ministry; that there was division in the Cabinet; and that the party was breaking up. The surmise was further confirmed by the division on HARVEY'S motion respecting the Pension List; and on Lord CHANDOS' motion for the reduction of the Malt tax. On both these divisions, Ministers had but trifling

majorities. On the first, the majority was EIGHT only ; on the second, but FOUR. There was, besides, a more serious cause of difference in the Cabinet. It was this—the appropriation of the surplus revenues of the Church. On that subject we shall have to touch ; and trace its consequences to their effect.

It became evident that the question of the Repeal of the Union was looked upon by Government as likely to form an important item in the transactions of the Session, from the marked manner in which it was alluded to in the KING's speech, at the opening of Parliament—“ I have seen”, said his Majesty referring to Ireland :—

“ I have seen with feelings of deep regret and just indignation, the continuance of attempts to excite the people of that country to demand a Repeal of the Legislative Union.

“ This bond of our national strength and safety, I have already declared my fixed and unalterable resolution, under the blessing of Divine Providence, to maintain inviolate by all the means in my power.

“ In support of this determination, I cannot doubt the zealous and effectual co-operation of my Parliament and my People.

“ To the practices which have been used to produce disaffection to the State, and mutual distrust and animosity between the people of the two countries, is chiefly to be attributed the spirit of insubordination which, though for the present in a great degree controlled by the power of the law, has been but too perceptible in many instances.

“ To none more than to the deluded instruments of the agitation, thus perniciously excited, is the continuance of such a spirit productive of the most ruinous consequences ; and the united and vigorous exertions of the

loyal and well affected in aid of the Government, are imperiously required to put an end to a system of excitement and violence which, while it continues, is destructive of the peace of society; and, if successful, must inevitably prove fatal to the power and safety of the United Kingdom."

This was an invitation to Parliament to express a decisive opinion on the Question, when the opportunity arose; and thus give a blow to the agitation in its very infancy—before it acquired greater strength and became irresistible. It was this that O'CONNELL dreaded.— However, he had no choice. The country called for discussion in Parliament; and accordingly, on the twenty-second of April, Mr. O'CONNELL moved for the appointment of a Select Committee, "to inquire into and report
 " on the means by which the dissolution of the Parlia-
 " ment of Ireland was effected; on the effects of that
 " measure upon Ireland, and upon the labourers in hus-
 " bandry, and the operatives in manufactures; and on
 " the probable consequences of continuing the Legisla-
 " tive Union between both countries." This was an extensive subject; and O'CONNELL, in a speech which occupied five hours in the delivery, handled it with his usual clearness and force. He commenced by showing that the Irish were, from the earliest period of English connexion, anxious to be placed under the laws and Constitution of England, and that by several treaties with successive Monarchs, their right to an Independent Parliament was established. He then went into a short history of the system of rule established in Ireland, and the misery of its people up to 1778, when the penal laws were relaxed. He next described the prosperity which followed Legislative Independence. He showed how a rebellion was fostered, in order to bring about the UNION, and the bribery and corruption by means of

which it was carried. He demonstrated from the authority of LOCKE, and the arguments of PLUNKETT and SAURIN, that the Irish Parliament had no constitutional power to destroy itself, and take from Ireland its right to legislative self control.

“As well might the frantic suicide suppose, that by the act that put an end to his bodily existence, he destroyed his soul, as you to suppose that by transferring your power, you extinguished, so far as the question of right is concerned, the Irish Parliament,” was the terse and eloquent observation of PLUNKETT, addressing the Irish House of Commons. Mr. O’CONNELL then went into a financial statement respecting the debts of both countries. He dwelt upon Ireland’s right, under the articles of the Union, to additional Representatives; he touched on the evils of absenteeism. He demonstrated by shewing the consumption of such necessaries of life, as tea, coffee, &c., that the prosperity of Ireland increased more rapidly than that of England, from 1782 to 1800; while, from 1800 to 1834, the prosperity of Ireland was arrested, and that of England advanced in a prodigious ratio. He dwelt upon the political misgovernment of Ireland. From 1800 to 1805, she was under the Insurrection Act and Martial Law; from 1807 to 1810, the Insurrection Act; again, from 1814 to 1818, the Insurrection Act; from 1825 to 1828, the Algerine Act; from 1829 to 1833, the Algerine Act again; and, lastly, the Coercion Act. He reminded the House of what Lord GREY had said during the discussion on the Union—“that the Irish would wait their opportunity to recover the rights of which they were unjustly deprived.” He then described the state of Ireland; its increasing destitution in the midst of increasing exports; and he concluded by charging all her misery on the Act of Union. This was an able, argumentative speech; but if we

are to judge of it by the effect produced on the country, and judge also of his celebrated speech in the Corporation of Dublin, in 1843, by the same standard, we should say that the last was the greater effort.

He was replied to by Mr. SPRING RICE, in a speech which was shortly afterwards followed by his election to the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his final transit to the House of Lords. It was the speech of a politician—a financier—statistics were his stronghold. ARCHIMEDES is reported to have said, speaking of the power of the lever—"Give me but a resting place, and I will move the globe." So it was with Mr. RICE and his statistics; give him from the parliamentary blue books—a parcel of calculations; let him draw from the one hundred and fourteen reports on Ireland, some well prepared statistics, and he should prove anything; even the preposterous assertion that Ireland was prosperous. Because Commissions of Inquiry were issued without number, therefore the Union was not injurious to Ireland! Because a free trade was granted to Ireland, *for the advantage of England*; by means of which the price of land was increased beyond its value during the war, only to fall again; by means of which capital was taken from manufactures and vested in land; by means of which the agricultural population was multiplied, only afterwards to be starved—because free trade in corn was granted to Ireland, for the benefit of England, that could get no supply from the Continent—the Union was not injurious to Ireland! Because, some dozen acts of Parliament were passed relating to minor matters—and amongst others, the Million Act, for the Protestant Clergy, and the Tithe Composition Act, for the Protestant Clergy—therefore the Union was not injurious to Ireland! Because there was poverty before the Union, therefore the excessive poverty that followed

was not caused by the Union ! Because the exports had increased, as had likewise the capital of the country, therefore that increase was owing to the Union ; as if that increase would not have been quadrupled, judging from the experience of the twenty years before the Union, if Ireland had a domestic legislature to foster manufactures, and encourage a more scientific cultivation of the soil ;—as if the generally increasing poverty of the millions did not overthrow any argument derived from the factitious increase of exports, and the natural increase of capital arising from an increased population. The few made money, but the mass remained poor ; and, instead of the oaten bread that ARTHUR YOUNG speaks of, the horse-potato became the only food of four millions of people. But it is idle to pursue the subject. Who can deny that the present system of centralization must continue to impoverish the country ? Who can deny that a domestic legislature, of independent functions, to watch over the local interests of nine millions of people, would be a blessing to both countries ? It would relieve England of increasing embarrassment on account of a country which she does not understand, Ireland—and by making that country more prosperous, tend to increase the consumption of her manufactures in her best market—while, by removing all causes of national collision, both kingdoms would be bound together by affection and interest. We cannot conclude our remarks on this memorable debate, without recording our opinion of the admirable speech made by the present member for Cork, DANIEL CALLAGHAN, Esq. It was at the time, considered one of the best on the subject, and any one who now peruses it, will admit the correctness of that opinion. It was argumentative and forcible ; and most successfully brought Mr. RICE's favorite weapon, statistics, to bear effectually against the Union. The

original motion, however, was defeated by an overwhelming majority, and Mr. RICE's Amendment carried. The Amendment was, that an Address be presented to the KING in the following terms :—

“ We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons, in Parliament assembled, feel it our duty humbly to approach your Majesty's throne, to record in the most solemn manner our fixed determination to maintain unimpaired and undisturbed, the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, which we consider to be essential to the strength and stability of the Empire, to the continuance of the connexion between the two countries, and to the peace and security and happiness of all classes of your Majesty's subjects.

“ We feel this our determination to be as much justified by our views of the general interests of the State, as by our conviction that to no other portion of your Majesty's subjects, is the maintenance of the Legislative Union, more important than to the inhabitants of Ireland themselves.

“ We humbly represent to your Majesty, that the Imperial Parliament have taken the affairs of Ireland into their most serious consideration, and that various salutary laws have been enacted since the Union, for the advancement of the most important interests of Ireland, and of the empire at large.

“ In expressing to your Majesty our resolution to maintain the Legislative Union inviolate, we humbly beg leave to assure your Majesty, that we shall persevere in applying our best attention to the removal of all just causes of complaint, and to the promotion of all well considered measures of improvement.”

The voting was—For the amendment, five hundred

and twenty-three—For Mr. O'CONNELL'S motion, thirty-eight. Majority four hundred and eighty-five.

The day O'CONNELL was going down to the House of Commons to make his great speech, introductory of the motion respecting Repeal, he was accompanied from his residence, in Langham-place, by a friend, on whose arm he leaned, and who observed that he was unusually silent and abstracted as they passed along. A crowd followed them, principally Irish, but O'CONNELL seemed unaware of, or indifferent to, their presence. When at length he and his friend came to cross a street which opened a full view of Westminster Abbey, he stopped, and after contemplating for a short time that noble and venerable pile, took off his hat, and in the most open, impressive and distinct manner blessed himself, saying—"The Lord Almighty be merciful to your soul HENRY THE 7th, who left us so magnificent a monument of your piety. You left provision at your decease to have perpetual masses offered up for your soul; but from the time that ever execrable brute, HENRY THE 8TH, seized on the revenues of the Church, and of course laid hands on that endowment with the rest, perhaps no human being recollected to aspirate the words 'the Lord have mercy on *your* soul,' until it struck the humble person who now offers that prayer with the utmost sincerity." He had just concluded, and was about continuing his route to the House, when he received a smart blow on the back, and turning round in front of the eager crowd, Mr. GULLY, then member for Pontefract was beside him. "There you are, DAN O'CONNELL," said he, (with a good humoured laugh), going down cool and quiet, to do your work." O'CONNELL, reciprocating the blunt, good nature of the man, threw himself at once into a pugilistic

attitude, and squaring his arms, said—"And tell me GULLY, isn't that the way to do it?" A cheer from the crowd gave him an encouraging response, and after shaking hands with Mr. GULLY, he passed on. The same evening, while walking in the lobby, awaiting the hour when his motion might be called on, he was accosted by Mr. CHARLES BROWNLOW, afterwards Lord LURGAN, who came up to him, holding his son by the hand; "and that youth," O'CONNELL frequently after observed, "was the most glorious boy I ever set eyes on." "Mr. O'CONNELL," said Mr. BROWNLOW, "I wish to introduce this boy to you, with a view of asking your assistance to recover a title which our family have a right to in Ireland, but which has been placed in abeyance; in the event of your achievement of the Repeal of the Union." O'CONNELL—

"replied "And Mr. BROWNLOW, do you thus address me seriously or jeeringly?—for your introduction of the boy with such a view is curiously timed, at a moment when all the world, with some exceptions of honest and earnest men, are holding me, my proposition, nay even my very intellect, cheap, on account of the motion I am about to bring before the House to-night." "I assure you," said Mr. BROWNLOW, "I have spoken seriously and respectfully." "It reminds me," said O'CONNELL, "of a passage in medieval history, where a fellow was passing along a crossing in one of the public ways at Rome, and he happened to recognise the JUPITER (statue) of the Capitol lying on his face and constituting one of the stepping stones. The person who so discovered it, knelt down beside it, and uncovering his head he said, 'Oh, JUPITER, accept from me at least the manifestation of reverence and respect, once accorded to you by millions. I am not deterred from paying you this homage by the miserable condition to

“ which, temporarily I trust, you have been reduced; and
 “ recollect that this was performed by me while every
 “ rascal in Rome was treading you into the mire.’ Mr.
 “ BROWNLOW, good evening, I shall always remember
 “ this interview.”

Mr. O’CONNELL did not unfold his whole case before the House. He said himself, in a letter dated the 22nd April—“ That he did not use one-tenth of the materials “ with which he was provided, and that he exhausted half “ his speech in proving the *rights* of Ireland.” The speech, however, was given to the public in a corrected form by Mr. MACCABE, the well known author of the *Catholic History of England*, and whose able pen we hope will be employed in giving to the world the reminiscences of his illustrious countryman. Mr. O’CONNELL, it will be seen, altered altogether the terms of his motion; and instead of moving for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Act of Union, he confined himself to a Committee of Inquiry—on the very natural supposition that that inquiry would not be denied, whether the Union was beneficial or otherwise to Ireland. But in that speculation he was disappointed. One English representative alone voted in the minority, Mr. KENNEDY, member for Tiverton, and he lost his seat in consequence.

The address of the Commons was concurred in by the Lords—on the motion of Lord GREY, seconded by Lord BROUGHAM, who made a most bitter attack on O’CONNELL. To show the hostile feeling which existed against him in the mind of this nobleman—we transcribe that part of his extraordinary harangue which referred to O’CONNELL. It cannot tarnish the memory of our great countryman; it betrays the unrelenting enmity of this ex LORD CHANCELLOR, who will be forgotten, or remembered with anger or with pity, when the object of his malevolence will be spoken of with admiration.

“Was it not lamentable (said he) that the country was not allowed to run that race for which nature had made her capable. And great God! why was it so? It was not that there existed grievances, not that the people complained, not that blots existed in the laws—with the exception of one or two insignificant ones, which he hoped with the assistance of their Lordships would speedily be razed and obliterated from their books, it was not for any of these causes, but it was because there existed certain individuals, who were gifted by that same nature with great talents—who had improved those talents by assiduity and perseverance—who were possessed of large acquirements, and gifted with the capacity of raising themselves to wealth by honesty, and to power by innocent ambition; it was all because these misguided men—as much mistaking their happiness as their honour, and at war with their own interests as well as with the interests of their fellow-subjects, preferred to honest industry, and its creditable and honourable gains, a life of agitation—a life of agitation supported by a species of personal as well as political mendicancy—a state of which, even to the unfortunate victims of such practices, if their natural and honourable feelings were not perverted, must be attended with unbearable shame. There had been geniuses of other times reduced to poverty and beggary. One had recorded his own disgrace in his own immortal verses.—He was the second of modern poets, perhaps the third poet of all ages. When reduced to poverty, not by his own idleness or extravagance, but by the political contests of his country, and by persecution over which he had no control, he begged his bread during a season. But far from glorying in his beggary, he has recorded that the sense of shame under which he received the alms of his fellow-countrymen, was such, that the mere sensation

made every fibre in his system quiver with shame. He trusted that few were gifted with such genius that they could long suffer the shame, or brook the indignity of living by such means as these, or who, in order to perpetuate such unmanly support, could continue to plunge their country in distress and ruin."

Both Houses waited together on the KING with their joint address. His Majesty responded to the address in nearly the same terms; and thus a solemn compact was entered into by the three branches of the Legislature to do justice to Ireland, to remove her just causes of complaint, and promote all well considered measures of improvement. The united declaration had all the essentials, without the form of an Act of Parliament.

This pledge, and the all but unanimous decision of the House of Commons, with other subsequent circumstances, to which we shall speedily refer, induced O'CONNELL to alter his tactics as regarded the Repeal of the Union. He never altered his opinion on the question; but he thought that after such a pledge, it would be prudent for the cause of Repeal, to give the Imperial Parliament a trial. It was "an experiment" which he did not expect would succeed—but for that very reason he thought it prudent to afford the trial. If they were disappointed in receiving justice—if the pledge were not redeemed—then the agitation would be trebly effective. O'CONNELL was evidently disheartened at the result of the debate. The motion was forced on him against his better judgment. It came before the House of Commons prematurely, and the consequence was, the Parliamentary weakness of the Irish Repeal party was exposed. The question should have been fostered for better times; and under continuing misgovernment, it would have strengthened until it became irresistible. It received, however, a stunning blow. At the same time, as a pro-

mise of redress was given, O'CONNELL felt he had no alternative but to accept the terms, and try the "experiment," until the cause again revived. But, in a question like the Repeal of the Act of Union, which is a kind of constitutional revolution—agitation is its vitality—by that means it flourishes and grows strong. If the Agitation of it be abandoned, it becomes weak and sickly. Mr. O'CONNELL discovered, when too late, the full force of this truth. If the principle of Domestic Legislation be essentially good, it should never, even temporarily, be relinquished. O'CONNELL soon altered his course of policy, and the Government did all they could to conciliate him. Lord STANLEY'S Tithe Act, making the compositions compulsory, was a failure. The impost was not more easily collected than before. The Loan of a million sterling to the Clergy, it was evident could never be repaid. It was necessary to shift the responsibility of the payment of Tithes on the Landlord, by giving him a premium for undertaking it; and it was necessary to remove the Clergymen altogether from contact with the people, by converting the Tithes into a Land Tax payable through the Crown. It was therefore proposed to re-value the Tithe Compositions—to take TWENTY PER CENT OFF—and convert that reduced sum into a Land Tax, redeemable at fourteen years purchase.

Mr. O'CONNELL opposed this scheme, because it would be making Tithe Proctors of the Landlords, for the four-fifths of the impost, which were chargeable on the occupiers, and because the attempt to recover the amount through the Landlords may involve opposition to the payment of rents. He afterwards submitted to Parliament a scheme of settlement which originated with Mr. DAVID ROCHE, the Member for Limerick. He proposed, in one of the best speeches he ever delivered in

Parliament, that one-fifth of the title composition, re-valued, should be struck off altogether; that one-fifth should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund; one-fifth to be a charge, redeemable on the inheritance; and the remaining two-fifths to be paid by the occupiers. To this plan he afterwards added, that the surplus of the Church Temporalities, after satisfying the just demands of the establishment, should be appropriated as Parliament should determine. Lord STANLEY was so struck with the temperate tone of Mr. O'CONNELL, in making this proposition, that he was half converted, and made use of language as regards the LIBERATOR, which, coming from him, deserves to be recorded—"I say it," were his words, "with the utmost sincerity, that if the Hon. and learned gentleman will not only here, but in all other places, follow up the same mild and candid mode of argument which he has this night adopted, not only will he never hear from me one word of political acrimony, but he will also materially advance THE OBJECT WHICH I BELIEVE HIM TO HAVE AT HEART, THE INTEREST OF HIS OWN COUNTRY." He concluded, by saying—"I have spoken without one feeling towards the Honourable and Learned gentleman, except that of sincere gratification at the tone and manner in which the Hon. and Learned Gentleman has this night addressed the House, and of earnest desire both for the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's own sake, and for the sake of Ireland and the Empire; that the tone and manner might be continued. If so, I can assure him that the feeling would be reciprocated on my side of the House, and that it will render his future Parliamentary career in the highest degree valuable; and will add to that distinction which the Honourable and Learned Gentleman has already gained, BY THOSE TALENTS AND THAT

“ ELOQUENCE OF WHICH NO ONE IS A GREATER ADMIRER
“ THAN I AM.”

This discussion excited a marked feeling in the country. The utmost anxiety was exhibited by the Government to improve the friendly relations now springing up between the great Irish leader and themselves. The Marquess of WELLESLEY had previously recommended the renewal of the Coercion Act, with the exception of the Court-martial clauses. He was informed, probably by Mr. LITTLETON, how matters were turning out in Parliament, and how much it would facilitate an arrangement, if the three first obnoxious clauses with regard to political associations, were abandoned likewise. Lord WELLESLEY, to facilitate the arrangement, did accordingly recommend the withdrawal of those clauses. Mr. LITTLETON overjoyed at this, and having received Lord ALTHORPE's consent, communicated the matter to Mr. O'CONNELL. The information had the desired effect, and a cordial feeling sprung up between him and the Irish Secretary. The information was communicated to him in confidence. Without mentioning names, he stated to the Irish Members that the objectionable clauses in the Coercion Bill were to be withdrawn. In the meanwhile Lord GREY wrote over to the Lord Lieutenant, that he could not consent to give up the three first clauses of the Bill; and therefore it was resolved to re-enact the measure in its full integrity, with the exception of the Court Martial clauses. This was resolved on at a Cabinet Meeting, at which Lord ALTHORPE and two Ministers were left in a minority. However, sooner than risk the dissolution of the Government, both he and Mr. LITTLETON determined to give up their own opinions, and agree to introduce the Bill. When Mr. O'CONNELL heard this he was naturally indignant, and stated he had been deceived by a Cabinet Minister. Then the secret of his in-

terview with Mr. LITTLETON transpired. Lord GREY had not heard of it before, and of course was furious. Mr. LITTLETON resigned his office, promising never again to confide in an AGITATOR. These circumstances so embarrassed Lord ALTHORPE, and rendered his position so much more difficult, inasmuch as, individually, he was opposed to the full renewal of the Coercion Act, that he too tendered his resignation and it was accepted. This again produced the resignation of Lord GREY, and thus the first Reformed Ministry was broken up.—“O'CONNELL DID IT ALL.” His influence in Parliament at this time was nearly equal to his power with the people. During the progress of the transactions we have just related, Mr. STANLEY and Sir JAMES GRAHAM left the Ministry, because of the recognition by the cabinet of the principle of appropriation of Church property, to such purposes as Parliament should direct. On that subject, no one could be more unbending than STANLEY, as his celebrated speech shortly after his resignation, on Mr. WARD's motion, amply proved. Thus did the affairs of Ireland again and again break up the English Ministry—thus was she destined to be the arena of political and party conflict.

It was during this period that Lord ANGLESEY's remarkable letter to Lord GREY was made public. It was written during the time of his greatest unpopularity in Ireland. The document is a noble composition,—so full of just sentiments—so full of anxiety for the welfare of Ireland—so clearly indicative of necessary remedies or natural evils, and strongly demonstrative of the danger of delay. The first and greatest evil was the enormous Church Establishment, and the Marquess of ANGLESEY's remedy was, to cut it down to fair and adequate dimensions, and appropriate the surplus of income to

the benefit of the Irish people. The appearance of the letter at that peculiar period produced no slight sensation. The very question to which it particularly referred, was then under the consideration of Parliament, and the conclusion come to by many was, that Lord ANGLESEY himself gave the document publicity. But that was a mere calumny. It was only by piecemeal the contents of the letter were communicated to the public. First, Mr. RONAYNE, Member for Clonmel, read extracts from it during the debate on Repeal. Then another member read another extract on the Tithe agitation. At last the document made its appearance at full length, in the columns of the *True Sun*—Lord GREY denied all knowledge of it. But having ascertained the date, the official file was examined, and the letter was found. Mr. RONAYNE did not communicate to the House how the copy got into his possession. But at a subsequent period the general understanding was, that it was fished up by some servant in the Castle, and came through him to the hands of Mr. RONAYNE. That gentleman suffered by the transaction. The Government vindictively refused him even the place of Assistant-Barrister, and he died of a broken heart.

Early in the history of these occurrences it was that O'CONNELL addressed two letters to the *Pilot*, from which we extract the following passages, to show the policy he was inclined to adopt. Writing on the 10th May—he closed one of the letters thus :—

“ I cannot conclude without congratulating the people of Ireland on the good sense and steadiness with which they are awaiting the experiment which we, Repealers, are making on the *sincerity*—I might, and, indeed, should say, the *VERACITY* of the Ministers. They have solemnly pledged the parliament to remove “ THE JUST

COMPLAINTS of the people of Ireland. A Cabinet Minister—one of the first in rank, and one of the highest in talent—has publicly and unequivocally declared, that the tithe system in Ireland, as it relates to the Established Church in its present form, “is a just complaint.”—Shall it be redressed? Alas! I fear not. But why should I fear either alternative? If this “just complaint” be redressed, then the people of Ireland will have obtained a great, a solid, a permanent advantage. If it be not redressed, then the honest, the undismayed Repealers will, with me, point to the falsification of the address, and exclaiming against “the living lie,” feel more deeply how impossible it will be to expect justice from any other than a domestic legislature.

“This experiment *being made*—as the phrase is—it is in progress. The people of Ireland are showing their readiness to receive, with heart-binding gratitude, the act of justice which they require, in fulfilment of a most solemn promise. For my part, I am ready to make every sacrifice to obtain the fulfilment of that promise. What *will* the ministers do—promise and perform? Oh, I fear not. Promise, and falsify their own promise? Oh, I potently believe they will. Who, then, when their promise is thus trampled on by themselves—who, at least, that is honest, will presume to accuse the Irish people of being precipitous in seeking, by legal means, for relief from the only remaining source of having justice done to Ireland.

“Continue, therefore, I would entreat, my loved countrymen, continue your present attitude of perfect readiness of conciliation. Let another act of treachery to Ireland—if we are to endure it—be attributable solely to the folly or the spirit of hostility of Lord Grey and his Cabinet towards Ireland. His administration has hitherto been the most ungenial rule Ireland has ever felt. Let us see whether there be even a hope of amendment.”

Again, on the 28th of May, he wrote to the Electors of Carlow in the following terms :—

“ In the meantime, Ireland preserves her dignified attitude of readiness for either alternative ;—readiness—cheerful, affectionate readiness—to meet every measure of justice and conciliation in the best spirit of lively and useful gratitude ; readiness also (it must not and ought not to be concealed) to revert—should the doors of conciliation be closed, and justice, full justice, refused—to revert, I say, to her own constitutional resources, and to seek for, in peaceable mood, and by means sanctioned by every law, human and divine, that justice, from her native Parliament, which will HAVE BEEN refused her by the wicked folly and foolish wickedness of an un-Irish Parliament and an anti-Irish administration.

“ Once more I say to you, my respected friends, *the experiment is being made*. Everything favours its progress. The secession of the Stanley party gives it a new impulse forward. I offer myself to you to aid its advancement. If we succeed, we achieve mighty advantages, and a new system of government for Ireland.” If we fail, Ireland is too mighty to despair. He who now seeks conciliation, with heart and voice, will in that case—nothing desponding—point out the safe, because strictly legal paths to liberty, and once again exclaim—

“ Hereditary bondsmen, know you not,

“ Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.”

As the Church question, during the year 1834, was the great bone of party contention, and will form, in this work, the subject of necessarily frequent reference and description, we will enter into its history with some degree of minuteness. We have already seen how utterly ineffective, for any purpose but commotion, was STANLEY'S Tithe Act of 1832. Under that act, SIXTY

TWO THOUSAND POUNDS was advanced to the Clergy; the Government became Tithe proctors; the jails were filled with debtors for tithes, some of whom were imprisoned for sums below a shilling. The Court of Chancery issued over two thousand Tithe notices; and under an old Act, by which every person owing Tithes was considered a TITHE REBEL, the posting of the notices was substituted for personal service. The whole contest between the Attorney General and the people resembled a guerilla warfare. The Attorney General was armed with power; he had ample force at his command, but he could not overcome the difficulties he had to encounter, when an entire population was arrayed against him. The consequence was, that of this sixty thousand pounds, barely TWELVE THOUSAND was recovered, at the cost of over TWENTY THOUSAND. The Tithe composition was extended over the whole country, by compulsory enactment. But, in consequence of the determination of the people to get rid of the impost altogether, they took no steps to have their lands fairly valued for the composition; the result was, that their holdings were considerably over valued. The Compulsory Composition Act was therefore no boon to the Tithe Payer. But the system of passive resistance still continued. The incomes of the Clergy were not paid; and the Parliament, in 1833, voted one million sterling as an equivalent for the arrears. It was intended to secure, and to recover the Million, in the shape of a land-tax from the landlords: but, as will be seen, it never was effected. In 1833, Lord ALTHORP carried his Church Temporalities Act. A clause of that Act provided for the sale of Bishop's lands; that is, the conversion of the twenty-one year's leases into perpetuities. The surplus thence arising was to be applied as in substitution of Vestry Cess. The 147th clause further provided

that any additional surplus should be appropriated to such purposes as Parliament would direct. This clause, by STANLEY's interference, was struck out. In 1834, Mr. LITTLETON introduced an Act, which, as we have seen, struck a fifth off of the composition tithes, and converted the rest into a land tax, payable in the first instance, by the landlord, who was then empowered to recover from the tenant. This land tax was payable to the Crown. Here, at once, arose the question of surplus appropriation. It was evident to every one of reflection, that things could not remain as they were. A population of nearly eight millions of Catholics, ought not to be called upon to support a Church with which they had no religious connexion. That proposition no honest man can contravene. But putting that aside, as involving the question, who does really pay, it must be admitted that for the duties performed, the payment of SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND a year is too exorbitant. In Scotland the rate of clerical remuneration averages about two shillings a head, of the population, who are nearly all of the same creed. In Ireland, the payment is one pound thirteen shillings for every Protestant in the country. The disproportion is therefore enormous. Then, while some of the working Curates, who are indefatigable in the discharge of their duties, are miserably paid, Rectors received thousands from parishes containing not half a dozen; sometimes scarcely a single Protestant. It was clear then that great reform was required, exclusive of the question of the propriety of a Protestant Church establishment at all in Ireland—a question we have already discussed. Lord STANLEY adopted the broad assumption that if there were not a single Protestant in a parish, still the Incumbent and his successor were entitled to their full incomes, and that it was almost a sacrilege to touch them. Here at once was a difference between Lord STAN-

LEY and the GREY Ministry ; the result of which, as we have stated, was his secession from the Government. With him retired Sir JAMES GRAHAM, the Earl of RIPON, and the Duke of RICHMOND, &c. Mr. WARD's notice of motion was to the following effect :—

“ That the Protestant Episcopal Establishment in Ireland, exceeds the spiritual wants of the Protestant population ; and that, it being the right of the state to regulate the distribution of Church property, in such manner as parliament may determine, it is the opinion of this house that the temporal possessions of the Church of Ireland, as now established by law, ought to be reduced.”

This notice was the subject of discussion in the Cabinet, and it was resolved to meet it by moving the “ Previous Question”—that is, to get rid of it without expressing an opinion on its principle, in case Mr. WARD declined to withdraw it, on being informed of the resolution come to by the Cabinet. This resolution was, to issue a Commission to inquire into the relative proportion of Protestants and Catholics in each Parish in Ireland, and the incomes of each Incumbent, and to report the amount that might be reasonably deducted, according to the duties performed; and in the meantime, to withdraw the redemption clauses of the Tithe Bill then before Parliament. These clauses provided that the Church Commissioners should invest the money obtained by the sale or redemption of the proposed land-tax, in the purchase of Estates for the Incumbents ; thus at once, and finally, appropriating the property in a way the very reverse of what was contemplated by Mr. WARD and Mr. O'CONNELL. The Cabinet having agreed to this course, STANLEY and his friends resigned, and the Cabinet was immediately reconstructed. STANLEY'S retirement caused universal joy throughout Ireland. His intemperate, haughty demeanour, independently of his

high Church principles, rendered him very justly an object of general dislike. This is to be deplored; for he is unquestionably one of the ablest men and best debaters that ever took part in public life.

The issuing of this Commission of Inquiry, and the withdrawal of the redemption clauses from the Tithe Bill, satisfied the House of Commons; and Mr. WARD'S motion was thrown out by an overwhelming majority.

The following short letter from Mr. WARD, will throw further light on this question. It would occupy too much space to enter more largely on the subject. Besides, to do so is not exactly within our province;—

“ June 3, 1843.

“ MY DEAR SIR—I have had a difficult game to play here, in order to do justice to the great cause which I had taken up, and which I have endeavoured to serve most honestly.

“ It is still a question with me, whether I should not have perhaps done this more effectually by withdrawing my resolution after Mr. STANLEY'S speech last night, than by forcing it to a division; but I could not bear the idea of being suspected of anything like collusion, or a compromise of principle.

“ I must, however, entreat you to impress upon the minds of your countrymen the fact, that it was this speech which decided the fate of the division. The certainty that a man who held principles so incompatible with anything approaching to concession upon religious matters, had been driven by my original motion from the Cabinet—that his former colleagues had broken with him for ever, and that as a first result of this misunderstanding, a commission had been appointed, to which he would never have consented, with powers as ample as any of us could desire, satisfied the great mass of Eng-

lish members that the question was in fact decided, and that it would be unfair to press for more, when so much was already done.

“ You know, of course, that the appropriation clauses in the bill are given up—another consequence and proof of our victory—and that liberal ground of appeal in the tithe compositions are allowed. And now, my dear Sir, permit me to say this—we are engaged in the same cause, and have the same battle to fight. Whatever difference there may be as to the question of Repeal, to which you alluded in your first letter, let them be dropped at present. Receive the commission as a proof of sound and honest intentions. Assist them to supply us with *facts*, to put the grievance of your country in the strongest and clearest light, and leave these to work. They will work upon the honest and manly feelings of Englishmen; and however strong Protestant prejudices may still be, I have no doubt as to the result. You may make what use you please of this letter, and will even oblige me by giving it publicity amongst your friends, if you find that the vote of last night is not rightly understood. Those who voted for the previous question did so, in the belief that the objects of my resolution were practically attained, and that it was consequently unnecessary to insist upon the principle

“ I beg pardon for troubling you at such length, but the subject is one on which I feel deeply.

“ Believe me your's very faithfully,

“ H. G. WARD.

“ To A. C. O'DWYER, Esq., M. P.”

In this position matters stood, when Lord GREY finally retired from public life, after a long career of active and zealous exertion in the cause of his own country, and an undeviating course “of straightforward political honesty.” Political opinion in its rapid progress since 1830, had gone beyond him. He was too unbending and con-

servative to satisfy the popular expectation. He had enormous power at his disposal. He had the largest majority a Minister ever had in the House of Commons. He could have carried any well-considered measure of reform; Municipal Reform of a generous character; Church Reform; Law Reform; all, it was in his power to have carried without opposition, and he permitted his noble majority to be frittered away, in miserable expedients to protect property in Tithes, and in coercing Ireland. We doubt much whether he ever entertained any enlarged views with respect to that country. His Irish Parliamentary Reform Act was a meagre measure. His sustainment of STANLEY—his squabble with Mr. LITTLETON about the merest trifle—his resistance to the withdrawal of the three first clauses in the Coercion Act, united to prove the feelings of hostility he entertained towards the popular party in Ireland.

His successor was Lord MELBOURNE, who had previously filled the office of Home Secretary. Lord ALTHORP, at the earnest solicitation of Lord GREY, continued in office as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord DUNCANNON, afterwards Earl of BESHOROUGH, and recently Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, was appointed Home Secretary. In alluding to this appointment, Mr. O'CONNELL, in July, 1834, thus spoke in his place in Parliament :—

“ The Hon. member Mr. BARING, had expressed his fear that the appointment of Lord DUNCANNON to a Cabinet office, boded no good to Protestantism in Ireland.— Did the Hon. Member suppose the Noble Lord a worse Protestant than he was? What did the Hon. Member know of Ireland, compared to the Noble Lord's knowledge of that country? He was connected with that country by property, by long acquaintance, and by long recollections of family services. He hailed the Noble

Lord's elevation with joy ; he looked upon it as a distinct pledge that the people of Ireland would have justice administered among them, and no longer be made the instruments of a faction, as a pledge that his Majesty's Ministers, honestly, fairly, aye, and he would say bravely, intended to do Ireland right. He had great pleasure in the idea that the noble lord would have the influence which the honourable member for Essex seemed to fear ; because, though personally courteous, he had also great firmness, and he knew no man whose opinions were more guided by his judgment than those of the noble lord.— He did not know whether the noble lord would accept of this humble tribute from him, but it was wrung from him by the hon. member for Essex, and he should now say no more than that he thought his appointment the harbinger of peace and tranquillity to Ireland, and of honour and dignity to the Administration."

Mr. O'CONNELL and Lord DUNCANNON were, from an early period, very warm friends. The Great Agitator's influence with him, was to almost the latest moment of his life, unbounded. Had he a desire to employ it for his own personal purposes, he could have done so successfully. But he was above such acts. He was the national advocate of his country, and his thoughts were exclusively devoted to her interests.

The MELBOURNE Administration having expunged the three obnoxious clauses of the Coercion Act of 1833, it was re-introduced in the amended form, and passed into law without much opposition from the Irish Repeal Members—Mr. O'CONNELL declaring that they were as anxious as the Government that agrarian outrage should be reformed, provided it was done under constitutional forms, and provided the right of petition was not fettered.

O'CONNELL was censured for not voting at all, when

leave was asked to bring in the Bill, but in our opinion, without just grounds. He had pledged himself not to object to any bill confined to the suppression of agrarian outrage. Therefore until the Bill for that object was introduced, he could not take any step, one way or the other. When the Bill was introduced, he opposed it, on account of some objectionable clauses, and fought against them in Committee. But beyond skirmishing of this kind, in order to improve the measure, there was no vigorous opposition to its enactments.

The Irish Tithe Bill, amended materially by the exertions of O'CONNELL, who carried a clause in Committee, that *forty per cent.* should be taken off, and that the remainder should be the first charge on the inheritance, passed the House of Commons; but it was thrown out by a large majority, on the second reading, in the House of Lords; merely because it came to them sanctioned by O'CONNELL. Thus, for this year, terminated the agitation on the Church question. The Session of Parliament was soon after brought to a close—During its sittings, Mr. O'CONNELL had added considerably to his reputation as a ready debater—an experienced Lawyer, and a first class orator—His influence was advancing daily. It was predicted some years before, by a prophet, in one of the periodicals, that though unequalled as an agitator—though far exceeding HUNT as a mob-orator, though powerful from a balcony or platform, whence his sonorous voice could convey into magic effect, his stirring sentences to the ears of the listening thousands, still, if ever he entered Parliament, he would be sure to fail. The Sessions of 1833 and 1834, alone, falsified the prediction; in 1833, he made the House of Commons listen, and listen without a murmur, to his defiant language;—in 1834, the House was anxious for his advice, and heard with at-

tion every syllable he uttered. It even courted his cooperation in measures of a conciliatory character for Ireland. STANLEY, too, was glad to cry—PEACE—PEACE, and to praise the man he had so petulantly abused. Outside the House, O'CONNELL was becoming popular in England. He was the observed of all observers. He was constantly feted by the rich; and whenever recognised was followed and cheered by the people. His society was very much courted. He was a regular Lion amongst the dinners out of London. His conversational powers were very remarkable. He would at once, without the slightest hesitation, if asked for information, when he was in the mood to give it, pour forth, without effort almost unconsciously—in the most lucid and fluent language. It was delightful to listen to him, particularly when telling an anecdote. The music of his voice—his wit—his quaint humour—his smile—nay, truly captivating. No one knowing him in private would believe that he was the man who was so maligned; and in return for abuse, was so ready to pay back the compliment. His political antagonists have looked upon him at a distance as a demi-fiend—when admitted to his society, they were charmed with his manner, undeceived with respect to his disposition, and often converted to fast and firm admirers. At some of these private parties, attempts would be made to draw him into a speech; but he always, except on rare occasions, avoided the exhibition. GRATTAN once, at a public dinner, at the Freeman's Tavern, London, was called upon to respond to the toast of Prosperity to Ireland.—The whole company stood up eagerly anxious to catch what fell from him. He felt he was looked upon as a pet Lion—a kind of show; so he got up and simply said—“Gentlemen, Ireland has my best affections”—placing his hand on his heart—“I am ardently devoted to her,” and he then sat down, to the amazement and disappoint-

ment of the gaping listeners. So it was with O'CONNELL. He never indulged the curious, when he detected the object. But he never was churlish of his good story, always appropriate to the passing conversation, and told with perfect ease and beauty of language. It was a treat to pass an evening in his company, and in London, his society was most anxiously courted.

An American writer alluding to his Parliamentary career, in 1834, thus describes O'CONNELL's eloquence—

“ During the two visits I paid to the Old World, in 1834 and 1837, I made it a point of professional duty, to attend the Courts of Westminster, Parliament, and public meetings, to hear the leading orators of the age; and in looking back to the very extensive notes I made there, for after reference I find the description of some of their finest displays. I had the good fortune, on several occasions, to hear the first orators of the day, in Parliament, at the Bar, and in the Pulpit; and so far as an humble and unpretending judgment on these matters can guide me, I would place the illustrious living in the following order of precedence. O'CONNELL, I think, is the first orator of the age, for his rare concentration of intellectual gifts. He is logical, profound, sarcastic, bitter, humorous, playful,—and has a masterly command of all the earnest and touching passions. I have heard him at least fifty times, and in every variety of question; and every new display gave me a higher opinion of his varied, astonishing, and exquisite powers. In the commons, next to him, I would rank Lord STANLEY; then Sir ROBERT PEEL; and third, WHITTLE HARVEY—they are masters of debate; and from the two first, I have heard passages of eloquence, thrilling in effect, and masterly of their kind. In the sessions of 1834, the collision between Lord STANLEY and Mr. O'CONNELL, upon

Irish questions, and the Coercion Bill, led to several rencontres, which, if sketched at the time, would live for ever on the records of eloquence."

The change in the Government looked well for Ireland. The "Irish difficulty" broke up the GREY Administration; and brought into office men determined to carry out the pledge of the KING and the Parliament. A feeling got possession of the public mind, that the dawn of prosperity was about to open for Ireland. We believe there was some reason for these anticipations; but we shall see how they were disappointed. The Ministry were harrassed, impeded in every possible form, by the Conservative opposition in Parliament; and their popularity eut from under them, by the subordinates in office; who being either Orangemen or Tories, did everything to obstruct or neutralize the good intentions of the Government they were paid to serve; unfortunately too, the policy of this administration was, from the commencement, unwise in the distribution of offices in Ireland. It was plain the Marquess of WELLESLEY was a complete drag-chain on their progress, and weakened the popularity which they obtained through the influence of O'CONNELL, who proclaimed himself a "Ministerialist." BLACKBURNE, a most violent party man, was retained in the office of Attorney-General; DOHERTY, the personal foe of O'CONNELL, was made Chief Justice of the Common Pleas; and JOY, the undisguised leader of the extreme Tories, was made Lord Chief Baron. Was that conciliating Ireland? Was that carrying the spirit of the Emancipation in the spirit in which some years afterwards Sir ROBERT PEEL declared it ought to operate, in the distribution of places? No! temporising was the rock on which the Whigs split;—they courted their enemies, despised their friends, and suffered in consequence, until O'CONNELL's parliamentary labours having concluded

for the year 1834, we must follow him to Ireland; where we find him, for the first time, before the public, at Dunmore, near Waterford. After, as he himself described it to the people of Waterford, being tossed about for seven hours in the channel, he was brought over from England by a "*kettle of boiling water*"; *id est*, a steam packet. Nothing could exceed the enthusiasm of his reception. The moment it was ascertained that he had arrived, almost the entire population of Waterford, turned out to meet him. Though it was late when he reached Waterford, still the anxious crowds were waiting to hear him. He spoke but few sentences to them—yet they were full of import. He proclaimed himself arrived amongst them as enthusiastic a Repealer as when he left Ireland. He spoke of the rejection of the Tithe Bill, and denounced, in no measured terms, the Orange faction that now, under the leadership of the Earl of WINCHELSEA, was exhibiting so much virulence and chagrin. He was entertained the next day at a public dinner. He there declared himself a Ministerialist. He repeated the same sentiment a day or two after in Cork. Addressing his friends in that city, he made use of these words—"If you stand by me in suppressing all Whiteboy and agrarian disturbances, I promise you, aided as we are, by the Ministers, that I will effect much in a little time. This may appear vain in me, but have I not a right to be a little vain. The King's speech at the opening of the Session abused me—they thought it right to make the King abuse me; and now at the close of the Session the Lords have thrown out the Tithe Bill, because it was approved of by DANIEL O'CONNELL." In this speech he also declared himself a firm and unflinching Repealer. According to the doctrine of the present day, there is inconsistency in sustaining the Ministry in any measures

of justice to the country, and at the same time, agitating for a measure to which that Ministry are unalterably hostile. We confess, we cannot see, though we would advocate strict independence and united action, without reference to any Government, the inconsistency. Domestic legislation is an object so ardently desired by the Irish people, that no ordinary measures of justice will ever induce them to abandon it. It is, however, to be achieved solely by the force of public opinion, and through the agency of the Irish Representatives in Parliament. It is plain, then, that every concession granted—every improvement in the administration of justice—every extension of the franchise—are but additional instruments in the hands of the moral-force Repealers; to enable them, sooner, and with more certainty, to achieve legislative independence. Without, then, for a moment relinquishing the pursuit of the great national object, it was wise in O'CONNELL to assist the Government that he believed were disposed to do, to even a limited extent, Justice to his country—to give even five shillings in the pound of her rights. He had unbounded confidence in the integrity and patriotism of Lord DUNCANNON; and, unquestionably, as far as matters depended on that Nobleman—he could not over-estimate his desire to serve Ireland. He held an office that brought him in immediate contact with the Irish Government—he was Home Secretary; O'CONNELL was justified thus far in his confidence; and, but for the impediments in other quarters, much more would have been acquired than has since been obtained. Be that as it may, O'CONNELL acted neither then, nor afterwards, when Lord DUNCANNON was in a more intimate official relation with Ireland, as LORD LIEUTENANT, an inconsistent part, provided he did not relinquish the agitation for domestic legislation. If the Repeal agitation was merely intended to be a means to an end, and if that end was justice from

an Imperial Parliament; then we can very well understand, how the accomplishing that end would set at rest the ulterior demand, and the agitator's occupation would be no more. But if the object is, as it of necessity is, to have our own Parliament to manage our own affairs; then we say, that no concessions will turn the nation from that pursuit; and every amelioration effected in our social and political institutions, by increasing our moral strength, and improving our physical and intellectual condition, will not only bring us nearer the goal we are struggling to reach; but will also make its attainment the more necessary for the national happiness. A poor and barbarous country may exist calmly, in dependence on another state. But the moment civilization and prosperity dawn upon it, that moment the desire to have the control of its own affairs, becomes ardent and irresistible. Giving general support, to a Government that intended well for Ireland, was no injury, but the contrary, to the Repeal cause. The only question to consider was—whether the support was honest; whether it was given on patriotic grounds, or from personal motives. O'CONNELL's exalted position as the nation's advocate, his undeviating honesty through life, falsify any imputation of the kind. O'CONNELL never asked a personal favor of the Government. The appointment of his son, Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL, to the office of Registrar, has been held out as an instance to the contrary. Now the facts in reference to that appointment are these:—The appointment was in the patronage of the Attorney-General; that office was held at the time by Mr. FIGOTT, now Chief Baron of the Exchequer—Mr. O'CONNELL asked the appointment for Mr. STERNE HARTE, a Protestant gentleman. Mr. FIGOTT peremptorily refused him, to Mr. O'CONNELL's great mortification; and for three weeks there was a coolness between them. Mr. O'CONNELL

NELL had great influence with Lord MORPETH. He went to his Lordship in behalf of Mr. HARTE, but he told him he could not interfere with the Attorney-General's recommendation, which, to Mr. O'CONNELL'S astonishment, was no other than his own son, MORGAN. Thus the only place—with the exception of the late appointment of his son-in-law, CHARLES O'CONNELL, Esq., as a Stipendiary Magistrate—the only place any of his family ever got was against his will, and notwithstanding his earnest solicitation on behalf of another. O'CONNELL might have been wrong in his policy, but in intention he was right. Provided the Repeal cause was upheld, his policy was also judicious. An observation of his, made in 1834, may be given here as appropriate to this subject. Addressing his friends in Cork, he said—

“ If you will look back into the humble history of my political life, you will see that I have had always the good fortune at every stage, to encounter, sometimes the support, and frequently the rivalry—shall I call it?—of more outrageous patriots than myself; who gladly and properly availed themselves of every occasion to show their superior claims to popular support, by their more stern and uncompromising refusal to listen to any terms of accommodation with the enemies of public freedom.—Perhaps their plan was the more right—mine certainly has been the more successful; and whilst I can win any advantages for the people of Ireland, I will leave to others the enjoyment of more social, but less productive virtues.”

O'CONNELL lost no time, after the laborious session had terminated, in getting to Darrynane, and enjoying there his usual recreation. He was then in vigorous health, and there were but few, and those the most athletic, that he was not able to tire out during a long day's hunt. From Darrynane, annually, issued those letters on the current politics of the day, which will ever remain as en-

during monuments of his clear intellect and his love of country. This year, his letters to Lord DUNCANNON, on the faults, follies, and crimes of the Whigs, are the most remarkable—in them, he analyses the Government of ANGLESEY and WELLESLEY, in a most masterly manner; and he points out the injudicious policy adopted in the law appointments. As historical records of the time, these letters are invaluable. They are written with his usual force and perspicuity. To judge of these letters, after hearing both sides, we strongly recommend the perusal of SHARMAN CRAWFORD's letters to O'CONNELL, written in 1837. About this time, some little change was perceptible in the conduct of the Irish Government. O'LOUGHLEN was made Solicitor-General. But BLACKBURN still continued in office, and O'LOUGHLEN was censured for having done what PERRIN refused—namely, consenting to serve under one whose political principles were so opposed to his own. However, his appointment was a move in the right direction, and it gave general satisfaction. It was conferred on a Catholic, and at the same time, one of the ablest men at the bar.

While this partial reformation was going forward in the Irish Government, and some disposition was evinced to give practical effect to the Emancipation Act, an important change suddenly took place in the Councils of the State. THE MELBOURNE GOVERNMENT CEASED TO EXIST. The Court party was, to the last degree, hostile to the views of the Government respecting Church Reform. It became exceedingly nervous, when it found O'CONNELL approving of the Ministry. It looked suspicious. It was known that Lord MELBOURNE, though once a strong Conservative, had very decided views regarding the Church Establishment. It was said that Lord GREY, on retiring from office, suggested that MELBOURNE'S Government should be considered but provi-

sional, and, that when the opportunity arose, the KING should surround himself with more Conservative advisers. We don't believe a syllable of the insinuation. Of Lord GREY's hostility to O'CONNELL, there can be no question. O'CONNELL stated that it commenced so early as 1825, and that since that year it was "the directing principle "of his misrule of Ireland." Any alliance with the great Irish Agitator, he may have advised his Sovereign against. O'CONNELL was connected in his mind with the breaking up of his Government, and he must have felt doubly hostile at the moment of his retirement. However, that he advised the KING to bide his time, and when the opportunity arose, to abandon a Reform Ministry, we do not believe. We scout it as unworthy of his past life, and as inconsistent with his subsequent conduct.— Be that, however, as it may, the death on the 10th November, 1834, of the Earl SPENCER, father of Lord ALTHORPE, gave the KING the opportunity which the Court party desired. It deprived the Ministry of their mainstay in the Commons, and the KING looked upon, or pretended to look upon, the MELBOURNE Government as at an end. He was at the time at Brighton, and he sent for Lord MELBOURNE. His Lordship went down; was received, it is said, not over courteously, or at all events in that bluff manner for which WILLIAM was remarkable.— The KING communicated his views on the subject, and Lord MELBOURNE returned to town no longer Prime Minister of England, and was himself the bearer of a message to the DUKE OF WELLINGTON, to request his attendance at Brighton. The MELBOURNE Government, at the very moment they were organizing plans for a more liberal system of rule for Ireland, was at an end. The consternation and excitement, which this caused, were very great in London and through the Provinces. So little was it expected, that the following short announcement of it in the *Times* :—

“The KING has taken the opportunity of Lord SPENCER'S death; to turn out the Ministry; and there is every reason to believe that the DUKE OF WELLINGTON has been sent for. The QUEEN HAS DONE IT ALL;”—came upon the metropolis like a thunderbolt.

O'CONNELL was in Cork when the news arrived there. He was, that evening, entertained by the citizens at a public dinner, got up in a truly magnificent style. There he treated the news as scarcely worth a passing notice, because he considered it impossible a Tory Government could ever obtain a majority in a reformed House of Commons. He little imagined that while the Whigs in England were relying on their strength, the Tories were acquiring silently an overwhelming force at the registries; he little thought that the Freeman franchise, and the fifty pound tenant-at-will clause, which he supported during the passing of the Reform Bill, would be the chief instruments by which the Tories would again ascend to power. However he thought little about, or affected to think little about it, saying that it was of small consequence to Repealers whether Whigs or Tories were in power, and that changes of Ministries, if any thing, were advantageous to the cause. He characterised the news, which had that morning arrived, as *le commencement du fin*, and said the event would tend, ultimately, to victory in the cause of human amelioration.

Sir ROBERT PEEL was then at Rome, free from the cares of office, and enjoying himself amidst the remains of Roman greatness, which are so profusely scattered in every direction in and near the capital of the Christian World; enjoying himself, too, amidst the immortal productions of those great masters of the Fine Arts, of which he has ever been so distinguished a patron. Without him no Tory Government could be formed—nay further, the Duke of WELLINGTON stated to the KING that, since the

Reform Act, which made the Commons not only independent of the Lords, but also the controlling power of the State, it was necessary that the Prime Minister should be a member of the lower House. No Ministry, then, could be formed without having PEEL at its head. The Duke, however, coming soldier-like to the aid of his Sovereign, as he did on a late occasion, accepted the task imposed upon him, and assumed all the seals of office until PEEL returned. He became dictator *pro tem*. A King's messenger, Mr. HUDSON, was despatched for PEEL. The Baronet, the moment he received the despatch, on the 27th November, in company with Lady PEEL, posted off, and arrived in England in twelve days and a half—Mr. HUDSON, the messenger, having reached London several days before, performing the journey in a carriage as rapidly as was ever effected, even on horseback. The Tory government was then speedily completed. Two most extraordinary changes occurred during the absence of PEEL, and while the Duke was the government—the *Times* became a supporter of his government, and Lord BROUGHAM became a suitor for the office of CHIEF BARON. It is said that he very reluctantly parted with the Great Seals, and was by no means desirous to be thrown upon the shelf. But the King had a personal objection to him. The familiar manner which he is said to have spoken, at a public dinner in Scotland, of his Majesty—the kind of intimate terms he wished to convey he was on with him, when he talked of writing to the King on some paltry subject, so disgusted WILLIAM, that he never forgave him. In his anxiety to retain place, the Ex-Chancellor was following the example of his great predecessor, Lord BACON, with whom he possesses many qualities in common. Various are the conjectures respecting the rattling of the *Times*. Some allege that it

was pique on the part of Mr. WALTER, at being refused a baronetcy. If it were so—the refusal was injudicious—As was once said to the writer, by one who took a leading part in these transactions, “if they had given him a Dukedom, it would not have been too high a rate of purchase, for the advocacy of the great Journal”. It is said too, that its advocacy was purchased by the Conservative Club, at no less than EIGHTY-THOUSAND POUNDS, and that Lord ASHBURTON alone, contributed fifty thousand of the money. Whatever may be the cause of the change, the change took place, and its support commenced by announcing that the DUKE would march in the spirit of the times, and grant extensive Reforms. The first consequence of this tergiversation on the part of the *Times*, was an enormous diminution in its circulation. It will be seen, however, that it afterwards recovered, and speedily, its position.—In this crisis, O'CONNELL was not idle. Immediately on his arrival in Dublin, he formed the ANTI-TORY ASSOCIATION. To open its doors to Reformers generally, he gave up all topics of discussion except the question of resistance to PEEL and WELLINGTON. To admit such men as Lord MILTOWN, and other leading Whigs, who were not Repealers—the national question was laid aside. We confess ourselves not favorable to this policy. We think the agitation for Repeal, instead of being relaxed, should have been redoubled. It should never have been given up. It was this policy that afterwards caused such apathy amongst the people, from which nothing but a moral miracle aroused them. Aid a liberal Government, if you will—resist the Tories as expediency might suggest, but never cease, for a moment, from demanding, what alone can give a national character to your country—an INDEPENDENT DOMESTIC LEGISLATURE.

The ANTI-TORY ASSOCIATION met almost every se-

cond. day. O'CONNELL was its moving spirit. At every meeting he delivered a long and effective speech. It has been often a subject of amazement, how even his fertile mind could thus day after day pour forth on the same topic, a stream of uninterrupted eloquence, and each day in a different form—each day as fresh and interesting, as if he had never previously spoken on the subject. It was in this faculty that he excelled all orators, ancient and modern. There were many who could deliver more brilliant set speeches; but as a working speaker, untiring and practical, no man ever approached near him. Probably, one of his most brilliant bursts of eloquence, was when he learned that SUGDEN was appointed Chancellor of Ireland. Nothing could equal the effect it produced. It was so sudden, so unprepared, so natural. It is worthy of being extracted:—

“ The Tories have again come in, and their first act has been to appoint an Englishman. And, what! is the bar so degraded that it will not call a bar meeting—that it will not remonstrate—that it will not protest against this insult? Is the spirit of Ireland so far quenched—is the love of father-land so gone by, that not one voice but mine will exclaim against this profanation of Irish talent—this degradation of Irish intellect—this outrage upon Irish learning and acquirements—that all, all must be passed by, and an Englishman placed over our heads.— Oh! shame upon those who do not love their country! Oh! shame upon those who would allow any pitiful, pattery, miserable, political spleen to come between them and the genuine expression of their feelings! Oh! shame upon those who will allow unnatural divisions with their own countrymen, to deceive them upon being slaves to others! Oh! shame upon those who will say they ought to be treated as inferiors, and branded as slaves in their native land! And what profession is it which is

thus treated with contempt—one which HUSSEY BURGH enlightened with his brilliant oratory in his own times. That profession to which DUCARRY gave the beauty of language, consecrated by taste, and aided with the powers of a chaste eloquence. That profession in which I have heard the mingled sweetness of tunes, that came upon me like softly sounding bells—the bells of musical instruments, and pealing forth with facts beautified by illustration, and appealing to the feelings in the language of the tasteful and lamented YELVERTON. That profession in which I saw scattering around me, the brilliant corruscations of the ethereal genius of CURRAN. Yes, a genius that was as brilliant as it was warm—like a star that gives its whiteness to the milky-way, his mind poured forth a flood of light, and its magic was felt by all who came within its influence; and oh! it was accompanied by a solidity of intellect, a power of argument, a force of illustration; and a personal devotion to his country and his client, which ennobled the profession of the bar, and exalted human nature. There are alive some of us, who heard him, when he was the advocate of OLIVER BOND, and was surrounded by an orange yeomanry; such fellows, as we had the other day at the Exchange. I had just seen the amiable and excellent wife of that patriotic man part from him. I call him a patriot, for he loved Ireland, not wisely, but too well. I vindicate not his violation of the law; I speak but of the individual. CURRAN, almost in the hearing of that wife, ran to speak in defence of his client; and when the orange yeomanry drew their bayonets; more than a hundred of them did, even though in open court—he threw open his breast, exclaimed, ‘stab me—deprive me of my tongue of utterance; take my life, for which I have a tongue, and while I have life, I will do my duty to my client.’ What! am I to be told that a profession which produced himself, has not now in its mem-

bers one who will acknowledge himself an Irishman; who will not resent indignities offered to them as Irishmen, and as a profession. Oh! if it be so, let them wear their dog collars, and let English slave be branded on them, as they slink away from the frown of their masters. Let the boys hoot after them as they sneak to the courts; let the women spit upon them at Ormond market, as they go along—and let them thus, covered with the slime and filth of their country, go like eringing sycophants, and soulless slaves, crouch before their English Chancellor. There were many other brilliant men belonging to the profession; but have we not still many able and powerful men living. Have we not honest, independent ROBERT HOLMES. I would only take them from different grades in the profession—I would only ask to point out three—LOUIS PERRIN, ROBERT HOLMES, and my friend PICOTT, and I would ask, where are the superiors of HOLMES, PERRIN, and PICOTT to be found in any country, for more worth, knowledge, and learning—and yet all are passed by, and an Englishman is imported upon us. I have done upon this—I have dwelt upon it as men linger over a scene that it is a pleasure to recollect, and that has long past away—it is like the memory of my country—like the visions of her greatness, that come to those fathoming with their eyes the depths of Lough Neagh, when they fancy they see the splendour of her ancient days:—

“ Thus shall memory often in dreams sublime,
 Catch a glimpse of the days that are over;
 Thus sighing, look through the waves of time,
 For the long-faded glories they cover.”

The star may set; but brilliantly and gloriously it will yet rise, to precede the dawning light of freedom upon Ireland—(Hear, and cheers.) The genius of Ireland is still young, and we have beheld that genius shining forth.

around us. It has come upon us in all the brilliancy of patriotism in this room—even here we can attest its appearance. We know that the genius of the country is young; if it has slept, it will but awake with a giant strength, refreshed from the sleep into which Orangeism has cast it, and scattering as it ascends, a divine freshness from its wings, over a land green once more with Irish freedom.”

Sir ROBERT PEELE'S celebrated manifesto to the electors of Tamworth, appeared towards the end of December. It was the precursor of a dissolution. In that most cautiously worded document, he proclaimed himself a kind of *juste milieu* reformer of all our institutions, except of the Church. On that he took his stand. In resistance to the appropriation clause, he staked his government. About the very time this document was given to the world, the memorable massacre of Gurthroe, near Rathcormac, in the County of Cork, took place. It was a sad commentary on that manifesto. It was an indication, in the minds of the people, what was to be expected from a hostile administration. Seventeen heads of families were shot on that occasion. It is impossible to forget the consternation that this dreadful business created. The slaughter was committed in an endeavour to collect, from a poor widow, the tithes due for the past half year. The carnage was unnecessary. It is painful to recur to the memory of that transaction. We will not wound the feelings of any one by mentioning names, or holding up to reproach the persons who perpetrated the deed. It is unnecessary. Suffice it to say, that the deed was done; that to the sacrifice of human life, made at Gurthroe, may we attribute the subsequent defeat of the Tory Government, on the appropriation question, and the ultimate conversion of the tithe composition into a rent charge. It is singular, that Gurthroe means the

red field. The country people have a tradition that it derives that name from a similar carnage in former days.

On the accession of PEELE to power, the Protestant Conservative Association of Ireland dissolved—or, rather, adjourned its meetings *sine die*. The proposition was made by its truly gifted leader, Dr. BOXTON, the distinguished Fellow of Trinity College, a man of great firmness of character, of rare intellectual acquirements, and, but for his exclusive religious feelings, and his unmeaning apprehension of Catholic ascendancy, had a strong bias towards his country, and towards the cause of legislative independence. But though this step was taken on his suggestion, the violence of the Orangemen was not abated. A meeting of ultra Orangemen, presided over by the Lord Mayor, was held, in December, in Dublin. The most violent speeches were made, and a Protestant clergyman, the Rev. Mr. M'CREB, vented the following mad and ferocious effusion, which was, for years after, chaunted in every Orange society in Ireland :—

“ The power that led his chosen, by pillar, cloud and flame,
Through parted sea and desert waste—the power is still the
same ;

He fails not to the loyal hearts, that firm on him rely ;
So put your trust in God, my boys, and keep your powder dry.

The power that nerved the stalwart arms of Gideon's chosen
few—

The power that led great William, Boyne's reddening torrent
through :

In his protecting aid confide, and every foe defy ;
Then put your trust in God, my boys, and keep your powder
dry.

For happy homes, for altars free, we grasp the ready sword—
For freedom, truth, and God's un mutilated word :

These—these the war-cry of our march, our hope, the Lord on
high !

Then put your trust in God, my boys, and keep your powder-
dry !”

The Sovereign, in the exercise of his prerogative, having dismissed a Ministry which was supported by a large majority in the House of Commons, was obliged to exercise, still further, that prerogative, in order to sustain his new advisers. He dissolved the Whig Parliament. The year 1835 was, in consequence, ushered in by a general election. The Parliament that passed the Coercion Act for Ireland, no longer existed, and the Tory Government appealed to the country in the hope of getting one more suited to their purposes; and, of course, more hostile to the popular party in Ireland. In England they expected an overwhelming majority. The Freemen in the boroughs were at their command, for they were purchaseable. The Tenant-at-will electors were sure to support them, for they were under the control of the aristocracy. The Tories had been quietly, and without observation, adding to their strength at every registry; while the Whig party, with an overweening confidence in their strength, became negligent and inactive. In Ireland, however, the Tories were at a considerable discount, and there they experienced the most determined opposition. The election was a struggle of party, and enormous sums were expended in the contests. It is said that the Conservatives spent nearly a million sterling, and the doings of their London Club, the CARLTON, during the election, have become matters for historical record. Whatever could be done by the lavish expenditure of money, was effected. But the result was a failure. In Ireland, O'CONNELL took the lead in organising an opposition to them. The Anti-Tory Association in Dublin, which, as we have seen, sprung into existence last year, was but another of the many names, that, under varying circumstances, O'CONNELL'S great instrument of agitation.

had assumed. At its meetings, and through the assistance of the Press, O'CONNELL was enabled to sound the tocsin, to rouse the nation to exertion, to concentrate and give vitality and energy to the popular sentiment. The consequence was, that amongst the large constituencies, the cause of Reform was, almost everywhere, successful. In Kerry, in Meath, in Youghal, in Tralee, his sons and nephew were successful candidates—and he, himself, was, for the time, triumphant in Dublin; though it will be seen hereafter, that, after a fearfully expensive contest, he lost his seat on a petition. At the Kerry election, he was himself present, and of course aided the certainty of success in that County. It was during this contest that he recommended, that “a death's head and cross-bones” should be painted on the door of every elector, that voted for the candidate who would support the nefarious and blood-stained Tithes system. This recommendation was, for years after, the subject of severe commentary. We have no intention of justifying the sentiment which the expression would seem to imply. But this we do say, that it was intended, simply, to convey, in the strongest terms, his abhorrence of the man, that, acting under any influence, would vote for those who would perpetuate a system that produced such disasters as the Wallstown and Gurthroe massacres. The construction, that would be naturally put upon such a sentiment, never occurred to his mind; and it illustrates the remark we have more than once made, that he never while addressing a public assembly, sufficiently considered the importance of the most trivial expression falling from his lips. The least expression against individuals was trebly injurious and galling, coming from him, because it became the subject of universal comment. He forgot it, the moment that, in the excitement of speaking, it passed his lips. Not so, the injured individual. The wound

made was too deep to be speedily healed. At the Kerry election, he meant to convey, in the strongest possible manner, his opinion on the conduct of those, who went against the popular candidates; and he never reflected on the construction, to which the recommendation he used was fairly liable. His own observations on this celebrated election, at a meeting, in Dublin, the first of February, 1835, will throw light on the subject, and are, otherwise worth extracting, as indicative of the state of feeling then existing in Ireland:—

“ They say that I dictate to the people of Ireland. Dictation! there is none of it, except this, that I concur in the sentiments of the people of Ireland—that I am anxious for their liberties, and I sympathise in their wants and in their wishes, and that I talk aloud to them that which they think. I am nothing but the straw rolling on the surface of the stream. I show by the manner in which I am carried along, the strength, the rapidity, and the course of the current; but I no more lead the people than the straw leads the stream by which it is borne up; and what manifests it is this, that here, I am come to town last night, after some good battles. Here I am, after turning adrift, in Meath, an Orange tract distributor, and scuttling, in Kerry, a Lord of the Admiralty. I have sent the one to sound sweetly “ the Boyne Water” on the banks of the river, and I have sent the other, in a cockle shell boat, to ply between the island of Valentia and the main land. What a pity it is, that they have not both met to sing a duet together. “ Pity the sorrows of a poor” Orangeman, and a Lord of the Admiralty, who have been kicked out. Here I am come back from that greatest of victories, Kerry. A little tired, but not wearied—as hearty and as ready for another constitutional fight, as if the 30 years, which I have

spent in the struggle for Ireland, were making me young instead of making me old—meeting every where proofs of the affection and kindness of my countrymen—hearing the prayers, and receiving the blessings of my countrymen, dearer to me than all; rejoicing to find the rising generation lisping my name, and giving an “hurrah! for O’Connell,” as all the little boys were heard by me to do—almost before they speak distinctly, mixing up my name in their hilarity. It shows to me, that they have impressed the name of Ireland upon their hearts, and that whatever becomes of the present generation, Ireland is now rearing up a youth, too proud, too strong, too combined, too much animated with the genuine love of liberty, not to make Ireland a nation again, and have her parliament returned to her. Oh! a blessing be upon the rising youth of Ireland! And when the cold grave encloses me within its narrow limits, and I have gone to that judgment, upon which depends an awful eternity, I hope it may be mitigated by the prayers of those, who will then mention the name of O’Connell as a talisman, to rouse them to exertions for Ireland. Yes, I returned from that scene, delighted to perceive that my popularity increases with my years, and grows with my age, delighted, because that popularity is a pledge of my fidelity to Ireland. I am delighted too the more, because I find that, each year, I am hated still more by the enemies of my country—If there be a pleasure still greater than the love of my countymen, it is this, that I have the hatred of the enemies of Ireland—They have, during the last elections, given me five or six contests, and yet I and mine have beaten them every where—We beat them in Tralee, we begun the battle there, and my son was the first member for Ireland.—We beat them in Youghal—We beat them in the county of Dublin—We beat them in Meath

—We beat them in Kerry. And we have beaten them in Dublin. But, mark me well. Well, what I glory in is this, that in all those popular elections, there was not one instance in which there was the slightest violation of the law, not the smallest violence or offence to a human being, not one of the enemy touched, not a hair of their heads uncurled. We triumphed without a single offence being committed; and our glory is, that so strictly cautious was our conduct, that even those who opposed us, must be ready to admit the purity and propriety of our conduct. To be sure, some worthies got an excuse for voting against me. The KNIGHT of KERRY'S relation, JONATHAN DAVID LA-TOUCHE, did so. He is, to be sure, a great fellow!—Forsooth, he has got alarmed, because I talked in Kerry of a death's head and cross-bones. I did so when the blood at Rathcormac was streaming—when the wails of the widows, and the shrieks of the children were tearing my heart. When I did say that, I spoke it of the base and traitorous Catholic, who would go and join the slaughterers; and I thought it a good way to express my indignation, by wishing that a death's head and cross-bones should be painted on the door of every traitor to his country—Then the *Freeman's Journal* makes some apology for what I said in Kerry. I want no apology. I did say it then; and I would be very sorry if I did not say it. It was, to be sure, an ugly figure. But those who call it an ugly figure, are not aware that it is the arms of the Duke of Brunswick; the head of the illustrious family now seated on the throne of England. So that those fellows are bad Brunswickers after all. But those who are sensitive with respect to a picture of that kind are not in the least snocked with the reality. Instead of the death's head, which the imagination could paint, what do they say of the

reality—of RYAN, 'blood-boltered,' soaking the land with his blood? Instead, then, of JONATHAN LATOUCHE being affected by a death's-head, his sympathy should have been awakened for the widow's son. Would not the two brothers, the COLLINSES—they who were the support of their mother and six or seven minors—who never left them at fair or at market—who brought them home before the night came on—who watched over them with the attention of a parent and the affection of a brother—would not the view of those two lying in their blood excite sympathy? But the reality with some is nothing—the picture is everything."

It was during this election in Kerry, that his perfect knowledge of the Irish language was displayed on a remarkable occasion. He was in Tralee, at his Hotel—the Main-street was filled by a dense mass waiting to hear him. He presented himself at one of the windows, and spoke to them in Irish. It was said to have been the most eloquent speech he ever delivered. The topics were of the exciting kind. The recent slaughter at the "red field" of Gurthroe, was in itself a subject of painful interest; and when described in the expressive language of the country, had a powerful effect on the feelings. When he described the Widow RYAN, of Gurthroe, searching, amidst the dead, for her own darling son—going to one body, turning it over—laughing, in the wildness of joy, when she found it was not he—then going to another, and shouting in hysteric convulsion, for it was not his corpse; then to a third—it was the body of her only son, who, a short time before, was in the pride and energy of life, and his poor mother's mainstay. Then, how she turned the body—how the son smiled upon her in death—how she knelt down and kissed his cold gore. When he spoke in this strain, in the Irish language, to an Irish crowd, it can

easily be imagined the effect he produced. In point of fact, the enthusiasm this speech excited was extraordinary. He had the whole people at one moment in tears ; at another in shouts of laughter by his ready humour at the expense of his opponents ; and, for over an hour, he held an entire sway over their feelings ; agitating them with opposite emotions—the melancholy and the gay—the ridiculous and the serious, were alternately used as instruments by this gifted man, to carry with him, wholly and altogether, the men he was addressing. He was eminently successful. We shall have occasion in our next chapter, to refer to a similar display at Tralee, during another Kerry election.

His knowledge of the Irish language was often of great service to him on circuit, and many anecdotes are told of his detecting the perjury of an Irish witness, and the shuffling of the interpreter, in the same manner as BROUGHAM succeeded in the Queen's trial, by his knowledge of the Italian. But the best thing he ever did, by means of his proficiency in the vernacular, was during the Repeal agitation in 1833, when the Government first began to send Reporters to the meetings in the provinces, in order to watch the proceedings, with the view to prosecutions. The first *debut* of the Government reporters was at a meeting, if we recollect rightly, at Kanturk. The gentlemen were English, and belonged to Mr. GURNEY's reporting staff. They came on the platform and introduced themselves to Mr. O'CONNELL. He shook them by the hands, and said, to those about him—"Nothing can be done here, until these gentlemen are afforded every requisite accommodation." This was at once provided, and having assured Mr. O'CONNELL that they were "perfectly ready," and well provided for, he came forward to address the people, and

commenced his speech, to the great dismay of the Cockneys—in *the Irish language!* Having explained to the assembly who they were, and how he lumbugged them; he continued, in the same language, to address to the meeting everything he wished to convey to them—the people laughing all the while at the English Reporters, while they joined, very good humouredly, in the laugh raised against them. During the progress of the elections, statements were published, which raised the hopes of the Reformers. By the return from the contested elections, one would imagine that the Whigs would have the old majority in the New Parliament. But that was a mistake. It was soon found that those, who were put down as Reformers, were followers of the PEEL Ministry. In truth, Sir ROBERT PEEL had played so deep and guarded a game, and had given general expression to Reform sentiments, that he opened a wide door for those, who professed liberal opinions, to enter as his adherents. He professed to act up to the spirit of the Reform Act. The Whigs did no more. He maintained the principles of “Finality,” as regarded Parliamentary Reform—so did the Whigs. The difference between them was on the Church Question, and on Ireland. Their views on the Church were favourable to them in England, particularly in the Counties, where the Clergy of the Established Church had such extreme influence; and their professed Irish policy had not much effect one way or other. All these things combined to render it doubtful what party the professing Reformers would join within the walls of Parliament. Hence the miscalculations of strength, until the House of Commons met. Then, on the election of Speaker, the relative strength was ascertained, and it was found that a majority of barely TEN was returned in the new Parliament in favour of the Whigs. This majority was, altogether, made up by the Irish Representa-

tives. In England and Scotland, the Tories had a commanding force. But Ireland was always, and will ever be the "great difficulty" of that party. Ireland, during the general election, had fought the good fight for "Progress," and her representatives were now in a position to direct and influence. It was in this state of things, that the meeting of the Reform members took place at Lichfield House, in St. James's Square. It was after the division on the election of Speaker—when MANNERS SUTTON was defeated, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE, the Whig candidate, raised to the chair of the House of Commons. At this meeting Mr. O'CONNELL and other Irish Members attended. It has been repeatedly asserted, that at this meeting a compact was entered into between the Whigs and Repealers, the latter agreeing to sustain the former on certain conditions—namely, the appropriation of the surplus revenues of the Church, Corporate Reform, and the extension of the Franchise. The belief in the existence of such a compact was strengthened by a speech of Mr. SHEIL's, in October, 1835, to his constituents, in which the following passage occurs:—

"It is worth while to consider how we accomplished the overthrow of Sir R. PEEL. The Whigs, English and Irish, met at Lord LICHFIELD's. We felt that mistakes had been committed on both sides, and that mutual consciousness of error is a great inducement to sincere and lasting reconciliation. What did the Irish feel? I shall tell you. They had seen that whatever faults the former Whig Governments had committed, the transition to Tory rule was, beyond all comparison, more galling. The Grand Chaplain of the Orange Institution, was made Chaplain to Lord HADDINGTON; the Grand Treasurer of the Orangemen, made Treasurer to the Ordnance; Lord RODEN offered a high place in the Household; Mr. SHAW and Mr. LEFROY named Privy Councillors; an

Orange flag suspended over the head of the Lord Lieutenant, amidst the yells of factious ferocity at the theatre. Shouts to insult the Irish people at the orgies of Corporations, speeches delivered in power, in which the sternest terms of despotism were employed with the familiarities of household words—a combination of circumstances the most irritating to our just pride, the most offensive to our recollections, and the most painful to our anticipations: All this was indeed sufficient to make us feel, that if Whiggism occasionally made us smart, the galling and festering yoke of Conservatism, was not to be endured. On the other hand, the English Whigs began to perceive that they had made some mistakes with regard to Ireland; that the only likelihood, or rather certainty of governing the country well and wisely, was to be found in the adaptation of its institutions to its condition, and to the feeling, temper, and notions of the great majority of the people; and that it was absolutely requisite, in order to effect the junction, without which all efforts would be vain, to make a great concession, by the admission of a great principle, to Ireland. Both then, the English and Irish Whigs, have been taught a most useful lesson; the Irish having been taught not too rashly to seek redress, and the English not too slowly to concede it. Feeling our interests and those of the two countries to be the same, we formed a strong and faithful alliance; and, on the appropriation question, put an end to the Government of Sir ROBERT PEEL.”

We may, however, be permitted to state our conviction that there was no expressed compact at the Lichfield-House meeting, though there may have been an implied one. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, stated what his intentions were, and what his Parliamentary tactics were to be. These met the concurrence of O'CONNELL and his friends, and

to that extent alone, even by implication, did any compact extend. It is true that O'CONNELL always maintained the policy of supporting the Whigs in preference to the Tories.—Every one recollects the very, to the Whigs, complimentary reason he assigned for so acting; because they, the Whigs, were like an old hat, thrust into a broken pane, to keep out the cold. They were a kind of *pis aller*. Holding the reins of power, they shut out the Tories; and though, as the event proved, they were not able to carry through their own useful measures of Reform, owing to the resistance of the Lords, still they improved the administration of justice in Ireland; and in the executive department of the Irish Government, gave confidence and satisfaction to the people. On that broad principle, O'CONNELL supported them; and no one who loves his country, and truly appreciates the value, to the people, of impartial justice, can fairly censure him for this policy. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, many years after, speaking of this alleged compact, called it a pure invention, “a fable”—and O'CONNELL, in 1836, thus expresses his sentiments on the subject, in his celebrated letter against Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, addressed to the electors of Westminster:—

“The assertion, that such a coalition was entered into, is utterly false, to the full knowledge of those who so assert—and their assertion therefore is—I use their own words—*base* and *unprincipled*. There is not, and there never was, any such coalition. The *base* and *unprincipled* men—I use Tory words—who allege the coalition, know that it is impossible that such a coalition should exist.”

In consequence of the equally divided state of parties in the House of Commons, O'CONNELL's influence increased tenfold. His popularity too was at its height. On the first day of the meeting of the new Parliament, a large crowd assembled, near both Houses, to witness the

arrival of members, and to give expression to their feelings towards the prominent men of each party. At that time, the excitement and anxiety to know the relative strength of parties, were greater than on any former occasion of the kind. When O'CONNELL was recognised, the shout of welcome, with which he was received, was universal. By the humbler and better classes, whom curiosity or a higher motive brought together, he was equally applauded. He was cheered vociferously until he reached the Members' door, nor was he over anxious to escape this tumultuous exhibition of popular favour. He loved the shouts of the people. It was a testimony to his honesty and virtue: for the people are, in the main, correct judges of character. His popularity, at this time, in England, showed that the struggle at hand, and in which he was to take so important a share, was more one of principle than of party; and it stamped, as patriotic, the conduct he adopted.

Before we proceed in the history of the stirring political events, which gave so enduring an interest to this period of O'CONNELL'S life, we cannot avoid reverting to a speech which, before he left Ireland, he made in the Anti-Tory Association. It is interesting, as detailing facts, connected with the princely possessions of an influential Catholic nobleman, which, at the time, caused very much discussion. Sir VALENTINE BROWNE, commonly called Lord KENMARE, was a strenuous adherent of JAMES II. He commanded a regiment, of his own raising, at the battle of Aughrim, and was at the siege of Limerick. He was attainted, and all his title in his property came to the Crown, save so far as it was settled; for such, in those days, was the law of attainder. The property was settled on the heir male of the attainted Lord—and, under that settlement, his son, who was an infant at the time of the attainder, came into full posses-

sion of the property, and so long as there were heirs male, the property would continue in the family: but, the moment they failed, the property reverted to the Crown, in the place of Sir VALENTINE BROWNE, and his heirs generally, by reason of the attainder. The succession, in 1834, in the male lines, depended on the life of the present heir presumptive, then a boy. If he died, the property would, after the deaths of his uncle, and father, have become possessed by the Crown. It was all-important to get the law altered in this respect, the more particularly as it, in its then state, affected the incumbrances, which of course would have to be paid off, if the state of the law became known, and was not altered. O'CONNELL'S exertions, in having this injustice remedied, deserve to be recorded, the more particularly as his political sentiments were opposed in many respects, particularly on Repeal, to those of Lord KENMARE; and the anecdote is introduced here, as further illustrative how little he allowed political feeling to interfere with his personal exertions in the cause of right and justice.

“Lord KENMARE,” said Mr. O'CONNELL, “received the bulk of his estate from Sir VALENTINE BROWNE, who raised troops for King JAMES. He was attainted for treason, and he deserved to be so, for taking up with such a scoundrel as JAMES. Lord KENMARE has the estate as long as he has any male issue; but he has no children at all; or as long as either of his brothers had male issue. His second brother has one son—his next has no issue, so that there are only four lives, three of which are middle aged, and one, a boy, between the Kenmare family, and the crown having title to the estate. If that boy, and the three other lives died, before the incumbrances were paid off, they would not then be paid at all, as the estate went to the crown. Lord

KENMARE, last year, offered £40,000 to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, to be relieved from this state of things. They asked £50,000, and he has now the absolute possession of the property for nothing. Who got it for him? Here is the man. I am the man who got it for him. Without me it would not have been had; and even PIERCE MAHONY, who took some trouble with it, admits that it was I obtained it. I had even despaired of it myself. An Irish Fines and Recoveries Bill was about to be passed. The Government would not consent to have the clause, I proposed, inserted. I hoped to have prevailed, but totally failed, until a change of Ministry brought in Lord MELBOURNE. He was somewhat favourable, and I availed myself of it. I next had to get Lord BROUGHAM to understand the real state of the question, and to get him decidedly with me. I succeeded in getting Lord DUNCANNON with me, when Mr. LYNCH, the Member for Galway, told me he should pass the bill without the clause. I prevented him from doing so, and eventually succeeded in getting that clause inserted, which, but for me, never would have been done; and Lord KENMARE has now the complete possession of his estate."

The following different version of the facts, in reply to O'CONNELL's statement, appeared in a Dublin Paper, from "a London Correspondent":—

"The circumstances are these:—In the Session of 1834, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL for England brought in and carried through Parliament a bill, abolishing fines and recoveries in England, and all reversions that may be in the Crown. Mr. LYNCH, M.P. for Galway, introduced in the last Session a similar bill for Ireland. In the English bill there was no opposition to the clause rescinding the reversion of estates to the Crown, as from the long-settled nature of English property, there were few such cases, if any; but it was found that it

was not so in Ireland, from the political commotions that so long shook the country. LYNCH had asked O'CONNELL's co-operation to carry his bill: he refused. O'CONNELL was asked to bring in such a bill himself: he refused. The bill was represented as one of vital consequence to a great part of the landed interests in Ireland. What was that to O'CONNELL? He would not stir in the business. He was told that his co-operation would be eminently useful. The bill was referred to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests; they said they could not consent, as many of the Irish estates would revert to the Crown in the event of failure of heirs; and, as public functionaries, they could not resign such a sum of money as these estates would bring. LYNCH then refused to proceed with the bill, when thus curtailed by the veto of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, of the reversion clause. Mr. PIERCE MAHONY, the Attorney, was soon after examined before a Committee of the House, and, in reference to Irish estates, said that several purchases were made in the security and confidence, that such a risk as reversion to the Crown did not exist in the cases of the property so purchased; and he strongly urged that such a bill as LYNCH's should be passed, as giving greater security to property in Ireland. MAHONY made out a strong case, and produced a strong impression. LYNCH took courage from the altered aspect of the case, and brought the matter on again; and after various interviews between the members of Government, the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and a deputation of Irish Members, the bill was carried. When O'CONNELL, at the heel of the hunt, found that the bill would pass, he consented to support it, and spoke to Lord DUNCANNON."

We now return to the narrative of political events. We have seen that MANNERS SUTTON, notwithstanding

the personal claims which long standing gave him, was defeated by a majority of TEN in the election of Speaker; and Mr. ABERCROMBIE, the member for Edinburgh, and principal manager of the Duke of DEVONSHIRE'S property, appointed his successor. The next triumph was on the address, when Lord MORPETH moved an amendment, to the effect, that progressive reform should be the principle of Government, particularly as regarded the municipal institutions of the country, and the Church establishment. The amendment, after a protracted debate, and an adjournment, was carried by a majority of SEVEN. It was in this debate that O'CONNELL applied to Lord STANLEY and his "tail," the lines of the poet,

"So down the hill romantic Ashbourne glides,
The Darby Dilly carrying six insides."

Lord STANLEY, and his section, had not yet gone over to the Tories, but they were fast approaching that consummation. He had declared on the Hustings, and so had Sir JAMES GRAHAM, that they had no confidence in the State Physician, that had been called in by the KING, and, pledging themselves to no line of conduct, they professed to keep aloof from both parties. However, on the election of the Speaker, it was soon seen in what direction their opinions tended. The six insides were running down the hill fast into the Tory camp. The lines were so appropriate, and so admirably introduced, that they had a telling effect upon the House. The laughter was kept up for a considerable time, and O'CONNELL, with great apparent calmness, rebuked the hilarity he had produced. "It is quite congenial," he said, "to the genius and spirit of man, to mix merriment with woe, and the sound of laughter is often heard when the tear of grief trembles upon the cheek. Ireland will weep, when she hears of this coalition, this desertion from the cause of the people to the ranks of would-be patriots,

“and would be ministers.” The effect of this sally was as great outside as it was in the house, and the genius of H. B. has given the incident form, fashion, and immortality, by his inimitable caricature of the Coach, with the “six insides.” Every one of the figures sketched is a portrait, as indeed, are all the productions of his pencil. O'CONNELL was, for many years, a favorite subject of his humour, and it is a singular fact, that there was not a single one of these famous caricatures, in which he figured, that he did not carefully preserve, and exhibit occasionally to his friends. During the years 1835 and 1836, particularly when the Tories were so fond of representing him as the “Master” over the Government. H. B.'s illustrations of political events were numerous, and full of that genuine humour, so distinctive of true genius. It is said that it was Mr. RONAYNE, the Member for Clonmel, whom we have already seen figuring in the transactions connected with the publication of Lord ANGLESEY's letter, who gave O'CONNELL, the “Darby Dilly” quotation, and suggested its application, and that the LIBERATOR adopted it without acknowledgment. Lord STANLEY, as the heir to the Earldom of DERBY, and having six followers, whom he was carrying with him over to the Tories, made the quotation in its application most telling. The six insides were, Sir JAMES GRAHAM, Sir ANDREW AGNEW, Lord GEORGE BENTINCK, now the celebrated leader of the extreme Conservatives—LECHMORE CHARLESTON, Lord GEORGE LENNOX, and Sir STRATFORD CANNING. It was now a subject of speculation in the Clubs, on the Stock Exchange, and in all political circles, what the Ministry intended to do? Would they dissolve? No, because such a course, after the recent appeal to the country, would be both fruitless and unconstitutional.—Would they resign? No, for in that case, they would

retire from power, without having any opportunity of expounding their measures, so as to test, for their future prospects, the feelings of the people. It was then determined, notwithstanding the vote on the address to do as PITT did in 1784, when a far larger majority went against him on a vote of confidence. PEEL continued to retain office. But it was not destined that his retention of power should then be of very long continuance. In the meantime, there were constant skirmishes between the two parties in the House. The greatest bitterness of feeling existed, especially between STANLEY and his late colleagues, whom he designated as "thimble riggers," or, in other words, political cheats. We will soon see to whom the name would have been more applicable. Mr. SHEIL commenced his assaults on the Orange Lodges this year. He, Mr. FINN, the Member for Kilkenny, and Mr. HUME, ultimately broke them to pieces. O'CONNELL, on a previous discussion on this subject, introduced by his brother-in-law Mr. FINN, and connected with the presentation, at the Levee, of Orange Addresses to the KING, showed the illegality of the Orange Institution, or of any body bound together by secret oaths. To follow up this blow, Mr. SHEIL, in a speech of great point and talent, moved for copies of the opinions, given, many years before, by the Attorney-General, SAURIN, on the legality of these Orange lodges. The motion was carried. We shall hereafter see the object for which it was introduced.

The Orange faction, in Dublin, in the meantime, could not conceal their joy, when Lord HADDINGTON, as Representative of the PEEL-WELLINGTON Government, appeared amongst them. In the public Theatre, they had the daring effrontery to exhibit the Shibboleth of their illegal confederation, and to wave an Orange flag over

the box in which he sat. Nothing could be so irritating to the feelings of the people than such an exhibition. At the time it caused very great excitement, and was unhesitatingly condemned by PEEL. At all times nothing could exceed the daring and insulting demeanour of the Orange faction in Dublin. They were generally a low, virulent class of persons, and, in proportion to their ignorance, were their prejudices strong, and their acts violent. They were generally led on by such persons as DANL. M'CLEARY, the Tailor, or the Rev. Mr. M'CREE, or, in earlier days, by BRADLEY KING. The College boys used to join them, and the Theatre was the ground on which they stood triumphant. It was there they insulted WELLESLEY, by flinging the bottle at him; the prosecution of which, afterwards, ended in a bottle of smoke; and it was there HADDINGTON, as the Representative of the KING, was also insulted by having a party emblem placed over him, to indicate, as it were, his partiality and his prejudices. But they did not confine themselves to this manifestation. They carried their Kentish fire into the camp of the Reformers, and endeavoured, with Mr. M'CREE at their head, to disturb the Meetings of the Anti-Tory Association. But the Dublin coal-porters, whose services we have already alluded to, soon put an end to that species of annoyance.

While we speak of Lord HADDINGTON, we are reminded of a capital story told of him. On the day of his arrival in Ireland, observing the mile stones on the road from Kingstown marked "G.P.O." he questioned a gentleman on horseback, who happened to be Mr. THOMAS REYNOLDS, as to their meaning; when that gentleman, with the utmost solemnity of visage, assured him they were merely the abbreviation for "GOD preserve O'CONNELL." The effect produced on the Orange Viceroy, at this startling fact, may be better conceived than des-

cribed. We need not inform the reader that the letters, G. P. O. were the initials for GENERAL POST OFFICE.

This anecdote connected with LORD HADDINGTON, the temporary patron of the Orange faction in Ireland, reminds us of two very remarkable escapes O'CONNELL had, at different times, from the vengeance of the dregs of that PARTY. At that time, it was not a very great effort of imagination, to suppose, that even those letters on the mile-stones suggested prayers for his safety.

When, Mr. O'CONNELL went as Special Counsel, in the great will case of *Blackwood v. Blackwood*, to Downpatrick Assizes, where he achieved one of his greatest triumphs as a lawyer, some Orangemen of the North, at that time most violent in their personal antipathy to him, formed a conspiracy for his assassination. The place, at which it was resolved to effect it, was the village of Hilltown, between Newry and Downpatrick, on a bye road. When O'CONNELL reached Drogheda, he was met by one of his firmest and most devoted friends, who is still living—viz., NICHOLAS MARKEY, Esq., of Walshestown—popularly called, from old associations, “the Colonel.” This gentleman informed him, that he had good reason to know it was intended to attack him. O'CONNELL said he would not be frightened, from the discharge of his duty to his client, even by such a report, and had determined to go on, though grateful to Mr. MARKEY for warning him. “Very well,” said his friend, “I thought it would be so—I'll go with you, and I have provided myself with sufficient fire-arms for us both, as I have no doubt they'll be necessary.” Accordingly they set off, and on their way, towards Newry were stopped at different places by three or four Catholic Clergymen, who, having obtained like information, came to warn Mr. O'CONNELL of his danger; they could not deter him from

proceeding, neither could they induce him to change his route; and he, at length, reached Hilltown and drew up at the Hotel to change horses. The landlord at once came out to the carriage door, and said, "for God's sake, Mr. O'CONNELL don't stop to change—go on with those you have, for there's the greatest possible risk in a moment's delay—you were not expected so soon." This Mr. MARKEY prevailed on him to do, and they proceeded. They had not got far out of the Town when the traces broke, on which O'CONNELL, apprehending at first that the accident was preconcerted, said to his companion "Markey, we're in for it now, at any rate." Mr. O'CONNELL's own man, a faithful servant, named CONNOR, got down from the dickey, and said, "Sir, the best plan is to leave the carriage, and I will set the traces to rights—the road here has a curve of over a mile, "do you and Mr. MARKEY descend that hollow and cross the glen, which will bring you on the road again, and I shall be there as soon as you, so that when they come up and find only me here, they'll think themselves disappointed." Accordingly, O'CONNELL and his friend, taking their fire-arms with them, crossed the glen and arrived at the place indicated. But scarcely had the carriage passed down the hill, after repairing the traces, on its course to take up the travellers, than a body of Orangemen, armed to the teeth came out on it, examined the carriage, and finding nobody but the servant, retired in an opposite direction.

On another occasion, as he was proceeding on Assizes' business to Derry, a plan was formed to murder him—namely, by throwing the carriage over the bridge at Omagh—and a body of Orangemen were congregated for that purpose, O'CONNELL having received no intimation whatever of his danger on this occasion ;

but by one of those usual strokes of good luck, or rather Providential interposition, which followed him through life, it was found that part of the road leading to Omagh was in a very bad state of repair, and that circumstance preventing the rapid rate of travelling he always desired, it became necessary to make a detour by which the town of Omagh was avoided altogether, and O'CONNELL'S life again miraculously preserved.

Lord HADDINGTON'S reign, as Viceroy, was short.— During its continuance, he showed every favour to the Orange faction; and, in return, they accompanied him on his departure, to the place of debarkation, and he took his leave of Ireland, amongst the clatter of the Kentish fire, and the party shouts of Orangemen.

About the end of March, Sir ROBERT PEEL introduced the Tithe measure. With the exception of making a larger deduction from the incomes of the Clergy, it was precisely the same measure that was the previous year introduced by the Whigs, and rejected by the Lords. The Bill of the Whigs gave the incumbent £77 10s, out of every £100 income derived from the Tithe composition; and this £77 10s they placed as the first charge on the inheritance as a rent charge. The PEEL Government gave him but £75, but, in every other respect, adopted the provisions of the Whig bill. It will be seen that this very measure was afterwards carried by the Whigs, with the concurrence of Mr. O'CONNELL, and is now the law of the land. So much for political parties, and political consistency. However, on this measure, the struggle for power commenced; and on the result depended the fate of the Ministry. It was also proposed to forgive the portion of the million loan, advanced to the Clergy, and appropriate the remainder to Church purposes. These propositions, naturally, came upon the

House by surprise, on account of the opposition of the parties, composing that very Government, to a similar bill last year. However, it wanted one essential requisite, without which, Mr. O'CONNELL contended, it never would satisfy the people of Ireland;—that was the “appropriation” principle, even if no surplus really existed—and on that principle the battle was fought. There was a meeting at Lichfield House, at which Mr. O'CONNELL'S views were adopted—and it was determined that Lord JOHN RUSSELL should propose, as an amendment, or, rather, as an addition to the Government resolutions, the following.—

“That the revenues of the Church of Ireland should be submitted to a Committee of the whole House, in order that the surplus revenue, if any, be applied to the education of the people, without reference to the religious views of any class.”

Here Sir ROBERT PEEL threw down the gauntlet, and declared he never would sanction the spoliation. In the meantime, there was a good deal of angry collision between the parties, on account of the appropriation, by the Tories, of the measures of the Whigs. It was then new to politicians. It was afterwards found to be quite statesmanlike. They were charged with political plunder; and Mr. WINSTON BARRON shouted out, amidst the cheers of the House, the well-known lines of VIRGIL—

“Hos ego versiculos feci, tulit alter honores.
Sic vos non vobis nificatis aves.
Sic vos non vobis vellera fertis oves.
Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.
Sic vos non vobis fertis aratra boves.”

At the present day we may afford to laugh at these charges. Parties are broken up. It is measures, not men, the people now think of—and provided the measures confer benefit on the community, it is considered of no moment by whom they are proposed.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL, as was agreed on at Lichfield House, brought forward his motion. To understand the full nature of this appropriation question, we will, in the first place, give a statement of the, then, comparative state and income of the Established Church of Ireland and that of England, and also of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, from a document in our possession :—

“ In England, twenty-six Prelates administer to about six millions, out of a population of eleven millions.

“ In Ireland, eighteen Prelates administer to about half a million, out of a population exceeding seven millions, of which six millions are Roman Catholics.

“ In England, several Bishops receive only £2,000, or £3,000 a year.

“ In Ireland, none receive less than £4,000, and some £15,000.

“ The Revenues of the Irish Sees are derived chiefly from estates, and but a small part from tithes. The following statement of the number of statute acres of *profitable* land annexed to each See, is from a Report to the King, made on the 1st March, 1833, by Commissioners appointed to inquire into the temporalities of the Irish Church.

	Acres.		Acres.
1. Armagh ...	87,809	10. Ossory ...	21,730
2. Dublin ...	23,926	11. Meath ...	20,266
3. Tuam ...	39,531	12. Clogher ...	18,852
4. Cashel ...	20,406	13. Dromore ...	18,422
5. Derry ...	39,621	14. Cloyne ...	17,482
6. Down ...	30,244	15. Cork ...	11,477
7. Elphin ...	29,235	16. Clonfert ...	5,517
8. Kilmore ...	28,531	17. Kildare ...	5,074
9. Ferns ...	26,294	18. Limerick ...	4,171

Lands of abolished Sees, vested in Public Commissioners.

	Acres.		Acres.
19. Killala ...	18,567	21. Raphoe ...	1,392
20. Waterford ...	13,189	22. Killaloe ...	9,145

(Only the Town-Parks returned.)

	Acres.
<i>Profitable</i> Land annexed to the Irish Sees, exclusive of the unreturned Estates of Raphoe	485,880
Glebe Lands, returned in March, 1831	82,645
Wastes, belonging to the several Sees, except Raphoe	183,715
	<hr/>
Total	752,240
	<hr/>

“ The total quantity of *profitable* lands annexed to Sees, and Glebes, is about 600,000 acres ; and this, if properly managed, would let at an average rent of One Pound an acre. The See Lands are now let at low rents to the families of former Bishops, and other tenants, under short leases renewable on payment of fines ; but they have no just interest in these lands, and can be rightfully evicted, or be required to pay the full rent value of them on the expiration of existing leases. The full rent would yield an income of £600,000, from the profitable lands, which would be more than sufficient for the Church Establishment that Ireland requires ; while the wastes would be valuable sources for the employment and support of a portion of the poor.

“ The expense of all the clergy of the Irish Roman Catholics does not exceed 300,000- a year ; *voluntarily* given for administering to six millions of the population — 6-7ths of the whole. Yet the clergy of half a million, 1-14th of the whole population, seek to obtain upwards of £600,000, a year, in Tithes, although their Church possesses 600,000 acres of profitable land.”

It is plain, from this statement, that, for the purposes of religion, the Irish Established Church was too richly endowed—and that, without injuring the Protestant religion, that income might be considerably reduced, and the surplus appropriated to the education of the people at large. The Established Church was endowed for the purpose of sustaining and extending Religion. A

Church Establishment is simply, as PALEY says, founded on the principle of utility ; and, when it fails to be useful to religion, it should be, at once, abated. That is the doctrine of a distinguished luminary of the Established Church. Now it so happens, that the very opposite has been the result of this enormous endowment, and that Protestantism has dwindled under the influence of this great wealth. To understand this, let us quote a remarkable passage from Lord JOHN FUSSELL'S speech on this subject. He says:—

“ The total number of benefices is 1,456, of which 74 range from £800 to £1,000 a year ; 75 from £1,000 to £1,500 ; 17 from £1,500 to £2,000 ; and 10 from £2,000 to £2,800, which is the maximum. There are 407 livings, varying from £400 to £800 per annum ; and 386 livings exceeding £200. I have before mentioned that the total revenue of the Church of Ireland in 1716, was £110,000, being made up of the sums of £60,000 for the benefices, and about £50,000 for lay impropriations. Now, let us see what the amount is at present. I find it thus stated—

“ Tithe Composition	£534,443
Episcopal incomes, inclusive of Tithes		141,896
Deans and Chapters and Economy Estates		5,399
Minor Canons and Vicars Choral	...	5,183
Dignitaries, Prebendaries, and Canons		6,560
Glebe lands at 15s	68,250
Perpetuity Purchase Fund	30,000
		<hr/>
Total	£791,731.

“These are the present riches of the Church of Ireland, so that in the whole they amount to little less than £800,000. We, therefore, at once come to the question whether this large sum has really been applied to the religious instruction of the people, or to whose benefit it has been applied? Whether, while during the last century, there has been this enormous increase in the revenues of the

Church, there has been a corresponding increase in the number of conversions to the Protestant religion? All the information we have, and it is abundant, tends to show that such was the actual condition. By TIGHE'S History of Kilkenny, it appears that the number of Protestant families in 1731, was 1,055; but in 1800, they had been reduced to 941. The total number of Protestants at the former period was 5,238, while the population of the county, which in 1800 was 108,000, in 1731 was only 42,108 souls. From STUART'S History of Armagh, we find, that sixty years ago, the Protestants in that county were as two to one; now they are as one to three. In 1733, the Roman Catholics in Kerry, were 12 to 1 Protestant, and now the former are much more numerous than even that proportion. In Tullamore, in 1731, there were 64 Protestants to 613 Roman Catholics, but according to MASON'S Parochial Survey, in 1818 the Protestants had diminished to only 5, while the Roman Catholics had augmented to 2,455. On the whole, from the best computation he had seen, and he believed it was not exaggerated one way or the other, the entire number of Protestants belonging to the Established Church in Ireland, can hardly be stated higher than 750,000; and of those 400,000 are resident in the ecclesiastical province of Armagh. Without going into particulars, for which indeed he did not pretend to be prepared, it may be said, that, in Armagh, the numbers are 7 or 8 to 1, and in other parts of Ireland the proportion is larger. He had, however, an account relating to different dioceses, which he believed to be very accurate, and which he would state to the house."

Such being the position of the question, both parties joined issue on Lord JOHN RUSSELL'S motion, and the Government were defeated by a majority of thirty-three,

after a two nights' debate, in the course of which Mr. SHEIL particularly distinguished himself. In a few nights after Lord JOHN RUSSELL returned to the attack, and moved a resolution to the effect, that it was the opinion of the House, that no measure upon the subject of Tithes in Ireland could lead to a satisfactory and final adjustment, unless it included the principle contained in the resolution come to by that House. This motion was carried by a majority of twenty-seven. This was so diametrically opposed to the pledged views of the Ministers, that they considered it tantamount to a vote of want of confidence, and immediately resigned.

Instantly, all the political circles were put in a state of excitement. BROOKES' Club was daily filled with an endless variety of expectants—would-be Lords of the Treasury—would-be Secretaries—would-be Commissioners. The CARLTON, on the other hand, was crowded with angry politicians—Landlords—West-India Proprietors—Irish Orangemen, all determined “to keep their powder dry, and bide their time.” Nothing could exceed particularly in Ireland, the fury, the disappointment of the Orange faction. Singular to say, though Sir ROBERT PEEL professed to discountenance this body, they never, in point of fact, got more encouragement, even in the Duke of RICHMOND'S time, than during the short administration of the plausible Baronet, in 1835. His Lord Lieutenant, by his acts, encouraged them, and GOULBOURNE, his Home Secretary, received, from them, addresses, for presentation to His MAJESTY. The anxiety to obtain a majority at the elections induced him to submit to their domineering insolence, and the apprehension of the Repeal agitation, caused him to allow the arming of the Northern Orangemen. Throughout the length and breadth of the land, wherever official influence could effect

it, we found the members of this secret institution filling every place of distinction or emolument, whether in the administration of justice, or in the financial departments of the State. Of what use, practically speaking, was Catholic Emancipation, in the sense in which Mr. SHEL used, during the olden agitation, value it, as opening the door to offices in the State to Catholics? None whatever. A few Catholics were allowed to ruin themselves by election contests for the sake of a seat in Parliament. But in every other respect there was no change. The people were still neglected, and everywhere around, we found Orange Judges, Orange Juries, Orange Magistrates, an Orange Church, Orange Corporations, and Orange officials in all the departments. Hence, though Catholic Emancipation was a great moral benefit to Ireland, by raising the nation from serfs to freemen, still its provisions were never, as yet, carried out, honestly and impartially, so as to allow members of the Catholic faith some of the substantial benefits it afforded.

It was in this state of things, that the votes of his own Parliament obliged PEEL to retire from power, to the great disappointment of Orangeland; for it was evident, that at last, a real change must take place in the system of governing Ireland. Many were the rumours afloat respecting the formation of the new Ministry. It was thought, in consequence of the manner of his late dismissal, that Lord MELBOURNE was not likely to accept, again, the responsibility of forming a Government. This conjecture was at first, sustained by Lord GREY's having been sent for by the KING. Lord GREY, however, declined the task; and advised his Majesty to apply to Lord MELBOURNE. His Lordship attended the summons, and during the entire second week of April, negotiations were going on, and interviews daily occurring, between the King and Lord MELBOURNE. It was said, at the time,

that his Majesty objected to give any position, in or out of the Government, to either LORD BROUGHAM or O'CONNELL. We are aware of the King's personal antipathy to both these personages. But we are quite satisfied, as respects LORD BROUGHAM, that no attempt was made to intrude him on his Majesty, to whom he was known to be distasteful; and as to O'CONNELL, though the necessity of conciliating him may have been discussed in those interviews, no place in the Government was ever contemplated for him. The London Press were strongly urging his case as one that demanded the anxious consideration of the Government. We find the *Courier* newspaper thus writing of him:—

“ We mentioned some days ago, that ever since the dismissal of the MELBOURNE Administration, Mr. O'CONNELL had acted in the most disinterested manner, without showing the slightest regard to his own personal objects; and we expressed a wish, that, in any new arrangements, the benefit of his great talents, and still greater popularity, might be obtained to promote the mutual advantage of Britain and Ireland. We again allude to this subject, merely to confirm the statement we formerly made. Mr. O'CONNELL has not only kept himself aloof from political intrigue of every kind, and has made no attempt to forward his own views, but has, as we have reason to know, most unequivocally declared, that whether in or out of office, he will support, with all his energies, any Administration resolved to do justice to Ireland.”

The *Morning Chronicle* at the same time, thus urges the necessity of securing his personal adhesion:—

“ When we are on the subject of Ireland, we need not say that wisdom and policy demand the conciliation of the men who are in possession of the confidence of the

people of that country. It would be madness to shut our eyes to the fact that Mr. O'CONNELL possesses an extraordinary hold of the Irish people—a hold the more powerful, as it is founded in a firm conviction that he is their friend, and that they owe him their emancipation from bondage. To wish that this were otherwise is childish. We say then, at once, that if it be wished to smooth the way of Government in Ireland, an endeavour ought to be made to obtain the services of Mr. O'CONNELL, in some way suitable to his qualifications. It was the great fault of the GREY Ministry, that they shut their eyes to the fact, that Mr. O'CONNELL was in possession of the confidence of the Irish people; and to mortify him, and to conciliate the men, whose chief claim was that they had uniformly opposed every liberal measure, was not the way to smooth the path of Government, and to overcome the distrust of the law which centuries of misgovernment had generated in the people. With intense anxiety for the stability of a Liberal Government, we deprecate exclusions which must necessarily lead to weakness.

“ If those now intrusted with the formation of a ministry suppose, that they can conduct the affairs of the country, by any other course than that which shall obtain the approbation of all liberal men, they will be woefully disappointed. If they do not take firm ground at first—if they do not look to the people, and to the people alone, for support, they will become objects of contempt to those, whom they wish to conciliate by neglecting the people. Instead of preserving peace, a shuffling and huckstering policy will, infallibly, lead to anarchy and confusion. A bold, decided, and honest course, is the only safe course.”

We have already seen, how, in 1833, O'CONNELL refused any terms of a personal nature. We will see, further, when we come to 1838, and have to record the offer to him of

Chief Baron, what his conduct then was, and the reader may be fully assured, that the acceptance of place, under any Government, never entered into his mind. What place, even if he were mercenary enough to dwell on such considerations—what place, in the power of Government, that a Catholic could hold, would be equivalent, either in influence or in emolument, to the position in which the confidence of his country had placed him. We shall see, during this year, and up to 1839, the unbounded influence he possessed over the councils of the Country—how he was—to use the words intended as a sarcasm by the Tories—“The master over the Government.” We shall see, also, how his enormous expenditure, consequent upon his position, was sustained by the people. What man, of any ambition, who had the energy and physical strength to undergo the toil it imposed, would abandon such a commanding post, in order to be shelved on the Bench, either in the Roll’s Court or the Exchequer? It would be far, far worse than the banishment Lord BROUGHAM complained of, when he was transported to the House of Lords. Still, notwithstanding this, we find the Conservative Journals endeavouring, with the utmost effort, to prejudice, in the eyes of the English people, the Whigs, by assertions of the most positive nature regarding their new alliance with the great Repeal Agitator. Thus, does the *Times* write:—

“The people of England ought to be made aware, in time, of a case on which the RUSSELL Cabinet is now sitting, and in the decision of which the King of England and all his subjects are, we grieve to say, too deeply interested. Every one knows, that the delay and difficulty, hitherto experienced by Lord MELBOURNE, in his attempt to form a Whig-Radical Administration, had arisen from the sordid fear entertained by his Lordship’s party, of the Repeal agitator, Mr. O’CONNELL. Intelligence, which

we fear may be true, states that this conspirator over the King's dominions in Ireland, knows the length of his own tail, and has contrived to get the length of another person's foot also. Mr. O'CONNELL insists that he shall have a vote in the appointment of the King's Representative in Ireland ! !”

The *Morning Post* is more specific, and goes into particulars, which will be now read with deep interest. It thus writes :—

“A communication was made by Lord JOHN RUSSELL to Mr. O'CONNELL, requesting in general terms, to know if the latter had any suggestions to offer with respect to the construction of a new Administration, and declaring, at the same time, that the noble Lord considered himself to be completely identified in the political character and objects of the hon. and learned gentleman, whom he was determined not to give up, although a separation between himself and all his political friends should result from his firm and persevering adherence. This produced, as it was, no doubt, intended to produce, an exposition, from Mr. O'CONNELL, of the terms which he regards as indispensable to his support of the new Administration: accompanied by an intimation that he is not personally desirous of office. We do not know that we have obtained full information of all the conditions demanded by the imperious agitator, and yielded, we believe, unreservedly, by the abject Whigs; still less do we believe that Mr. O'CONNELL will be long satisfied with these concessions, extravagant and pernicious as they are; but our readers will see that they imply what is little, if at all, short of treason to the King and Constitution of Great Britain, on the part, equally, of the proposer and the acceptors. 1st. Mr. O'CONNELL demanded that he shall have the absolute nomination of the next Attorney and Solicitor-General for Ireland, with the power of filling up any vacancies that

may occur in those offices. 2d. That he shall have an absolute vote on the appointment of the new Lord Lieutenant during the existence of the forthcoming Ministry. 3. That three great measures of State policy, for Ireland, shall be framed by him, and supported in Parliament by the whole strength of the Administration. The public will be astounded to learn that the whole of these conditions are acceded to without reserve. In pursuance of the first article of the O'CONNELL treaty, Mr. PERRIN is, we believe, already nominated for the office of Attorney-General, and Mr. O'LOUGHLIN for that of Solicitor-General of Ireland—In pursuance of the second article of the Treaty, Lord MULGRAVE has, already, been highly honoured by Mr. O'CONNELL's approbation as the new Lord Lieutenant. With respect to the third article, extensive explanations were demanded and given, the particulars of which we have not learned, except that one of Mr. O'CONNELL's remedial measures is a considerable enlargement of the elective franchise throughout Ireland, by means of lowering the qualification. This measure is, we understand, and the public will not be slow to believe, founded upon such principles as, when brought into practical operation, will give Mr. O'CONNELL an effective nomination of nearly, if not quite, the whole body of Irish representatives in the House of Commons. It is stated to us, and we believe correctly, that Lord MELBOURNE and the Marquis of LANSDOWNE objected, at first, very strongly to the articles of this monstrous treaty; but when Lord JOHN RUSSELL asserted that the support of Mr. O'CONNELL is absolutely necessary to enable any Government to carry on the public business in the House of Commons—and when he declared, moreover, his fixed determination not to form part of any Government of which Mr. O'CONNELL is not either a member or pledged supporter—the Noble Lords, at length,

and reluctantly, gave way. We learn that Sir JOHN HOBHOUSE, with the full approbation of Mr. O'CONNELL, is to be the new Irish Secretary. It is said also, and we have heard the statement from such a quarter as leaves not the slightest doubt in our mind of its correctness, that various attempts have been made to extort conditions from his Majesty, with respect to the creation of Peers and other exertions of the Prerogatives of the Crown; and, we rejoice to add, that to all such attempts his Majesty has offered a determined and successful resistance. It is probable to-night, or to-morrow, several writs will be moved for in the House of Commons, to supply the vacancies created by the new Ministerial appointments, and it gives us great pleasure to state that the new Ministers will have to encounter a vigorous opposition to their re-election. These contests will show what the country thinks of the traitorous cabal, which has presumed to barter away, in infamous traffic, the prerogatives of the Crown, and the rights, the welfare, and the religion of the country."

At length the new government was formed. The members of it were as follows :—

THE CABINET	Under Secretary of the Admiralty
First Lord of the Treasury	... LORD MELBOURNE.
President of the Council	... LORD LANSDOWNE.
First Lord of the Admiralty	... LORD AUCKLAND.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	... LORD HOLLAND.
Secretary of State for the Colonies	... LORD DUNDONALD.
Secretary of State for the Home Department	... LORD J. RUSSELL.
Foreign Secretary	... LORD PALMERSTON.
Colonial Secretary	... MR. CHARLES GRANT.
India Board	... SIR J. HOBHOUSE.
Secretary at War	... LORD HOWICK.
Board of Trade	... MR. POULTNEY THOMSON.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	... MR. SEYMOUR THOMSON.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Joint Secretaries of the Treasury	... Mr. FRANCIS BARING. .. Mr. E. J. STANLEY.
Attorney-General Sir JOHN CAMPBELL.
Solicitor-General Mr. ROLFE.
Judge Advocate General Mr. CUTLAR FERGUSON.
Postmaster-General Earl of MINTO.
Paymaster-General and Treasurer of the Navy Sir H. PARNELL.
Clerk of the Ordnance Col. LEITH HAY.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland Lord MULGRAVE.
Lord Chancellor for Ireland Lord PLUNKET.
Attorney-General for Ireland Mr. PERRIN.
Solicitor-General of Ireland Mr. O'LOUGHLIN.
Lord Advocate of Scotland Mr. J. ARCH. MURRAY.
Solicitor-General for Scotland Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Lords of the Treasury Lord SEYMOUR. .. Mr. ORD. .. Mr. R. STEUART.
Lords of the Admiralty Lord DALMENY. .. Admiral ADAM. .. Admiral Sir W. PARKER. .. Hon. Capt. ELLIOTT, R.N.
Irish Secretary Lord MORPETH.
Under Secretary Home Department Hon. FOX MAULE.
Under Secretary of the Colonies Sir GEORGE GREY.
Secretary of the Admiralty Mr. LABOUCHERE.
Secretaries of the Board of Control Mr. ROBERT GORDON. .. Mr. VERNON SMITH.
Surveyor-General of Ordnance Sir RUFANE DONKIN.

During these negotiations, Sir ROBERT PEEL kept his place on the Treasury Bench. When he received intimation that all was concluded, he, with a display and mannerism; for which he is remarkable, entered the House of Commons, first took his place on the ministerial side of the House, then, to produce an effect, walked over to the opposition side, and there sat, amongst Whigs, Radicals, and Conservatives, who were crowded

together without distinction or classification, while the opposite benches remained quite empty. At length, Mr. T. BARING, the new Secretary to-be of the Treasury, entered the House, and took his seat on the vacant Treasury Bench, and immediately the Liberal section of the House rushed over, amidst shouts of applause, and the utmost confusion, and took possession of the Ministerial side. Mr. O'CONNELL took his seat at the lower end of the Ministerial bench.

During this proceeding in the Commons, Lord MELBOURNE was, calmly, and amidst the silence of the House of Lords, communicating the intelligence of his having formed a Ministry. When he had concluded Lord ALVANLEY rose and said, he wished to put a question to Lord MELBOURNE. As this question, and the discussion that arose out of it, gave rise to a personal affair, which excited, for months afterwards, considerable sensation in London and in Ireland, we will give both it and the reply from the Parliamentary report of the transaction.

“ Lord ALVANLEY said he wished to know, before the House adjourned, whether Lord MELBOURNE had or not the powerful aid of Mr. O'CONNELL and his party. A question like that, in ordinary times, might very well have been left without an answer—but these were not ordinary times. The same Ministry, when in power only a few months ago, had the most determined opposition of that Learned Gentleman, and they, (the Ministry) denounced the Learned Gentleman in the King's speech in every thing but by name. Therefore, he now wished to know in what way, and on what terms, they stood with the Hon. and Learned Gentleman. It was impossible to suppose Mr. O'CONNELL would have withdrawn his opposition to that Administration, unless he was to be pacified in some way. The cause he asked the question so early was, that the Learned Gentleman, only a few

months ago, and for many months before, had lost no opportunity of stating his opinions with regard to the Repeal of the Union, and the necessity of the destruction of that House. The Noble Lord then referred to Mr. O'CONNELL's letter to Lord DUNCANNON, and some of his speeches to the Anti-Tory Association. He said that such language was not to be considered as mere words of course, when coming from such a quarter—coming as they did from the powerful, Honourable and Learned Gentleman; they were pregnant with meaning, and he considered that the Noble Viscount, under all the circumstances, was bound to afford the House all the information in his power.

“ To this question Lord MELBOURNE thus replied :— The Noble Lord asks me how far I coincide in opinion with Mr. O'CONNELL? I do not at all coincide with him in opinion. It is impossible for any such question to receive a simple answer. The noble Lord also asks me whether I entertain the same opinions which I did on a former occasion, which I apprehend to be when the Coercion Act was under consideration? I answer him that I certainly do entertain the same opinions, and that I persevere in them. The Noble Lord also asks me whether I have taken any means to secure the assistance of Mr. O'CONNELL, and upon what terms? I do not know whether I have the assistance of Mr. O'CONNELL or not, but I say most distinctly that I have taken no means to secure it, and I most particularly state that I have entered into no terms whatever, nor have said anything from which any inference can be drawn, in order to secure that I in individual support of the Noble Lord's question, therefore, I give a most decided negative; and if he has been told any thing to the contrary, he has been told what is false, and without foundation. When upon Lord Melbourne's observation, that he

was glad to hear, from Lord MELBOURNE, that he had given a veto to O'CONNELL and his radical crew, because he was sure that any Ministerial connexion with him or his tail would be the curse of the country."

In the House of Commons, a few days after, Mr. O'CONNELL had an opportunity of replying to both these Noble Lords, which he did with his usual severity, when dealing with such subjects. O'CONNELL, from temperament, was not capable of submitting to insult without retaliation. He was, naturally, of a proud disposition, and, in the face of the public, was not willing to yield to opposition, or to lie under a personal affront.

Colonel SIBTHORP, of whisker-and-moustache notoriety, in speaking of the new Ministry, and their prompter and adviser, O'CONNELL, said "I do not like the countenances of the hon. gentlemen opposite—for I believe them to be the index of their minds—and I will oppose them on every point, from the conviction that they could not bring forward anything that would tend to benefit the country. I earnestly hope to God, that we shall have a safe and speedy riddance from such a band."

Mr. O'CONNELL immediately rose and said—"I admire the good humour with which the gallant Colonel has made his observations, and although there might be something very remarkable in the countenances of the gentlemen on this side of the house, yet I think the gallant Colonel's countenance, at all events, is as remarkable as any upon the Ministerial benches. I will not abate him a single *hair* in point of good humour. It is pleasant, Sir, to have these things discussed in the good temper, and with the politeness, which characterises the gallant Colonel. Elsewhere they may be treated in a different style. Those considered by the resolution of this house, as unfit to hold office, may presume to talk of the Irish representatives in a manner highly unbecoming any Member, exceedingly indecent; an

indecenty that would be unsufferable, if it were not ridiculous. *There is no creature, not even a half maniac, or a half idiot, that may not take upon himself to use that language there, which he would know better than to make use of elsewhere. And the bloated buffoon ought to learn the distinction between independent men, and those, whose votes are not worth purchasing, even if they were in the market.*— I thank the gallant Colonel for the good humour with which he has introduced this, and if we are not to have him as a friend, it is pleasant to have him as an enemy.”

This was retaliation with interest. The half maniac or half idiot was intended to apply to the Marquess of LONDONDERRY, and the bloated buffoon to Lord ALVANLEY. The sarcasm, as we shall see, was felt acutely by one of the Noble Lords.

In the meantime, O'CONNELL returned to Dublin. His election, as Representative of the Irish Metropolis, was petitioned against. He succeeded in getting a commission to examine the witnesses, of whom the number was about seven hundred, in Dublin. His presence there was imperatively called for. He left London, and his first act, on reaching Merrion-square, was to address the “ People of Ireland,” on the present state of affairs. As this letter is important, as indicating his future course of policy, and his future expectations for Ireland, from the then Ministry, we will give two or three extracts from it.

After a few introductory observations, he says—

“ I come now before that people to avow myself the determined supporter of the Administration. To the King's Ministers, I have tendered my unbought, unpurchaseable, unconditional support. I have neither made terms or stipulations with them. It suffices for me, that their political principles are all identified with the cause of good government, and of justice to the loved land of

my birth. The tranquillity, the prosperity, the liberty of Ireland, also appear to me identified with the maintenance in power of the present Ministry.

“ It is under this impression, that I have tendered my support—it is simply, and singly, because I deem them the friends of Ireland, that they command my services, such as they are. Ireland is the object of my earthly idolatry; whoever is her friend, is dear to me as the red blood that flows through my heart; and the horrid specimen we have just had of Conservative and Orange ascendancy, makes me smile with delight at finding the vile and bigoted oppressors, deprived of power, and the prospect of a sanguinary contest between the people and the viperous Orange faction closed, I trust, for ever.

“ But as I have not deemed it necessary or wise to make stipulations or conditions with the present Ministry, I may, and I ought to be asked—what benefits I expect and anticipate for Ireland from the King's present Ministers?

“ I do expect from the present ministry those advantages for Ireland:—

FIRST—That the power and the insolence of the fell Orange faction must instantly cease. They are, indeed, quite inconsistent with the existence of this ministry.—The impunity with which every petty Conservative and Orange functionary could, and did, exercise his authority during the PEELE Tory administration, must cease; and the poor people will get some chance of justice and protection once more.

SECONDLY—The country will cease to be governed by its unrelenting enemies. The ministry will necessarily displace their own and the people's enemies, and employ the friends of the people and their own. How Ireland will exult, when they hear that the Castle has been cleansed of those who distorted everything to the preju-

dice of the popular interests, and countenanced and protected every body and everything that was hostile to the Irish people.

THIRDLY—The administration of justice in Ireland will be purified. The selection to judicial offices of political partisans will never more be heard of; men who have proved their integrity and independence by political honesty, in times when it was a crime to dare to be liberal, will be the fit objects of the selection of the new ministry; and the waters of justice will no longer be poured through mephitic channels, destructive of life and of property, but will flow in pure sources, diffusing salubrity and gladness over the thirsty land.

FOURTHLY—The highest offices will cease to be abused by the dull and merciless foes of Ireland. Lord HADDINGTON, poor man, is already gone. He is to be immediately succeeded by the high-minded and intelligent Lord MULGRAVE."

Again he says :--

"There is but one magic in politics, and that is—'to be always right.' Repealers of Ireland, let us be always right—let us honestly and sincerely test the Union in the hands of a friendly administration, and, placing no impediments in their way, let us give them a clear stage and all possible favour, to work the Union machinery for the benefit of old Ireland."

And he concludes this long and interesting letter thus :

"People of Ireland ! let us show ourselves worthy of the present all-important crisis. Let us forget all by-gone dissensions and injuries. Let us rally round a ministry which promises a new era—an era of justice and conciliation to the Irish people. Let us assist to reduce the Orangeists to their natural state in society—powerless, and therefore harmless—enjoying the full protection of the law, and the fullest use of their proper-

ties and rights as subjects, but deprived of political favor or power, and reduced to the level of their fellow-citizens. Let us assist the ministry, finally to adjust all rights connected with the system of tithes, and so totally to extinguish that unjust and blood stained impost for ever. Above all, let us aid them to establish, at once and effectually, a complete Corporate Reform, and to banish for ever from their usurpations, that pestilent nest of corporate bigots and monopolists, who have so long disgraced and plundered our towns and cities.

“ The new ministry are placed in a situation of much difficulty, and will want all the aid of all the friends of reform and amelioration. Let Ireland become a portion of their strength and security; and let them, on their part, so deal with Ireland as to be able hereafter to look back with pride to the pacification and prosperity of this country, as the work of their hands, and grateful Ireland will recognise them as the first of its benefactors.

“ We are, after all, a generous and a confiding nation. May our generosity be met with a congenial and a reciprocal spirit; and may our confidence be justified by the sincerity, the zeal, and the perseverance with which the King's ministers will manfully do justice to Ireland !”

While O'CONNELL was thus directing his attention to public affairs in Ireland, Lord ALVANLEY was endeavouring to wound his personal reputation, by calling on BROOKES's club to expel him. Touching this subject, the following correspondence took place :—

“ TO THE MEMBERS OF BROOKES'S.

“ London May 2, 1835.

“ GENTLEMEN—In the House of Commons, on the 20th of last month, Mr. O'CONNELL made use of expressions of a coarse and insulting nature with regard to me. I received the account of his having done so in the country, on the 21st, and immediately enclosed the following

letter for him to Colonel DAMER, who, finding that he had left town, forwarded it to Dublin by the post of the 22d :—

“ ‘SIR.—In the remarks you made on Monday last, on a question which I had put on the previous Saturday to Lord MELBOURNE, a question of a purely political nature, you used language which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. I am aware that you assume a right of insulting with impunity ; and I can hardly hope that you will make an exception in my favour, by doing that which every other gentleman would do, and giving satisfaction where you have offered insult. I, however, give you the option of doing so, and my friend Colonel DAMER will make the necessary arrangements, should you be inclined to avail yourself of my proposal—I am your obedient servant,

“ ‘ ALVANLEY.”

“ ‘ Clifden, Tuesday.

“ Having ascertained his arrival in Dublin on the 26th, and received no answer on the 28th, Colonel DAMER wrote to him again on that day.

“ ‘ SIR—I was in hopes to have heard from you by this time, and must request that you will return me an immediate answer to Lord ALVANLEY'S letter of the 22nd, as he is impatient at labouring under the stigma of your gratuitous insult to him on the 20th.

“ ‘ I am your obedient Servant,

“ ‘ GEORGE DAMER. .

“ ‘ 40, Grosvenor Street, April 28.”

“ To this second letter he has returned no answer. Having, therefore, tried those means to obtain redress which are customary amongst gentlemen, I now appeal to the only tribunal of men of honour to which we are both amenable ; and have, therefore, sent a requisition, already signed by several members of the Club, request-

ing the Managers to call a general meeting, to take the case into consideration.

“ It has been objected to me that this is a question of a private nature, and that the Club is not called upon to interfere. I acknowledge that it is of a private and personal nature ; but I think, that as the honour of two of its members is deeply implicated, the Club has a right to do so, if it think fit. The one has received a gratuitous insult, for which the other refuses in any way to atone, thereby claiming for himself an exemption from those laws by which the society of gentlemen is regulated, and without which the honour and feelings of every man would be at the mercy of those who might choose to cover themselves with the shield of irresponsibility.— Having that right, I think it will be but justice in this instance to exercise it, and to give to the one an opportunity of stating why he, a member of the Club, has remained under the stigma of an affront for which he has received neither satisfaction nor apology ; and to impress upon the other, that it utterly repudiates his assumption of being out of the pale of those laws of honour by which gentlemen are governed.

“ I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,

“ ALVANLEY.”

“ LETTER FROM LORD ALVANLEY TO THE MANAGERS OF BROOKES'S CLUB.

“ Gentlemen—I enclose you a Requisition, signed by 24 Members of BROOKES'S Club, which I request you to take into consideration as soon as you conveniently can.

“ I am your obedient servant,

(Signed)

“ ALVANLEY.

No. 2, Albemarle-street, May 3.”

“ REQUISITION.

“ London, May 2, 1835.

“ We, the undersigned Members of BROOKES'S Club, request the Managers to call a General Meeting of the

Club as soon as possible, to consider a statement that will be made to it of Mr. O'CONNELL's conduct to Lord ALVANLEY, both being Members of the Club.

ALVANLEY,	CHARLES STANDISH,
SEPTON,	HENRY BAILLIE,
DE ROOS,	C. ST. JOHN FANCOURT,
H. GALLY KNIGHT,	ROWLAND ERRINGTON,
THOS. S. DUNCOMBE,	VILLIERS,
ARGYLL,	W. H. IRBY,
JERSEY,	JOHN S. HIPPESELEY,
TANKERVILLE,	R. WILLIAMS BULKELEY,
STANLEY,	M. W. RIDLEY,
C. C. GREVILLE,	JAMES R. GRAHAM,
WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY,	LICHFIELD.
GEORGE BENTINCK,	

“ ANSWER.

“ The Managers of Brookes's Club having had under consideration a requisition signed by several members, requesting them to call a general meeting—

“ “ To consider a statement that will be made to it of Mr. O'CONNELL's conduct to Lord ALVANLEY, both being members of the Club, are of opinion that it would be inconsistent with the practice, and contrary to the established rules, to take cognizance of differences of a private nature between members of the Club ; and therefore decline to call a general meeting in compliance with the above requisition.

(Signed)

DUNCANNON,
ALBEMARLE,
JOHN BYNG,
EDWARD BLOUNT,
EDWARD ELLICE,
RONALD R. FERGUSON.

BROOKES's, May 3, 1835.

The reader will not fail to observe, that the first name to the reply of the managers, was Lord DUNCANNON—the nobleman who introduced him, in 1828, to the House of Commons, and who, in 1833, was so anx-

ious that he should take office. This will further account for the lasting friendship which O'CONNELL entertained for that patriotic Irish Nobleman. The ground for the application was, Mr. O'CONNELL'S not having replied to the communications made to him. Now, this is fully explained by the following correspondence, which afterwards passed between him and Colonel DAMER :—

“ No. 11, Grosvenor-street, May 5.

“ Sir—In consequence of the event of yesterday evening, I think it right to give publicity to the accompanying letter from Mr. O'CONNELL, together with my answer. “ I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

“ GEORGE D. DAMER.”

“ Merrion Square, Dublin, May 1, 1835.

“ SIR—I have received three letters—two purporting to be written by you, and one by Lord ALVANLEY; but under circumstances of such a ludicrous nature, that I can scarcely bring myself to believe them to be genuine. If not, I trust you will excuse me for giving you this trouble, and blame only the persons who used your name.

“ The first letter is, indeed, dated the 22d of April, but was not put into the London Post Office until the 27th, and did not, and could not, reach me here before the 29th, Thursday. Your second letter is dated the 28th, Wednesday, and expresses surprise that I did not before then answer your first letter, which I could not receive until the day after.

“ Again, Lord ALVANLEY'S letter is nothing less than a challenge to fight; to be delivered to me in London, as it would seem—rather an inconvenient distance, as the letter is dated at Clifden. But this letter assumes an air of more comicality, when it turns out to be one sent

by one person in Clifden to another person in London, to be transmitted thence to a third person in Dublin, to fight a duel at a truly long shot. This, as we say in Ireland, “bangs Banagher,”

“It is, however, after all, but an unvalorous—I believe I have coined the proper word—an unvalorous absurdity in Lord ALVANLEY, to send me a challenge, when my sentiments on that subject have been so publicly and so frequently proclaimed.

“But there is really a serious view of the subject, which it is, I do believe, my duty to take. It is this, that these letters are a distinct breach of privilege. It seems to me at present that I am bound to treat them as such; and if I continue to think so, I will bring them to the attention of the House of Commons accordingly.

“As to duelling, I have no hesitation to tell you, that I treat it with the most sovereign contempt, as a practice inconsistent with common sense; but, above all, as a violation, plain and palpable.

“At the same time, I wish you distinctly to understand, that, although I totally disclaim everything connected with duelling, yet I am most anxious on every occasion upon which any man can point out to me that I have anywhere, or in any manner, done him an injustice, to repair it to the utmost extent of his wishes. So if I have, without a complete justification, offended any man, I am always perfectly ready to make the fullest atonement he can possibly desire—therefore, neither Lord ALVANLEY nor any other person requires the absurd code of duelling with me. I would have the greatest alacrity to atone to any man who showed me that I had unjustifiably assailed him.

“I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

“DANIEL O’CONNELL.

“HON. DAWSON DAMER, &c.

“ I now learn that this matter has already got into the London Newspapers ; I presume, indeed, that it is only calculated for that meridian.”

“ ANSWER TO MR. O'CONNELL'S LETTER OF 1ST MAY.

“ May 5, 1835.

“ SIR—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 1, and as you therein state that you consider it to be your duty to bring Lord ALVANLEY'S letter to you of the 21st before the House of Commons, as a breach of privilege, I have recommended him to wait the result of such a determination.

“ I beg to affirm that I put my letter, enclosing Lord ALVANLEY'S of the 21st, into the usual letter-box of the Travellers' Club, before five o'clock on Wednesday, the 22d, and I must request that you will forward to me the envelope that enclosed it, that I may be able to ascertain from the Post-office whence this extraordinary delay originated.

“ GEORGE DAWSON DAMER.

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., Merrion-square.”

There can be no question that the whole of this proceeding was a political move, got up to damage the Ministry through O'CONNELL. Throughout England, every effort was made to raise the “ No Popery” cry, and every thing that tended to increase the hostility to O'CONNELL was of value. The Managers of BROOKES'S would not, however, lend themselves to the intrigue. We doubt not but Lord ALVANLEY acted from a feeling of personal injury ; but there were others behind the scenes that urged forward this proceeding. A similar attempt was made towards the end of the year 1835, by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, who had lately joined the Tories. He was urged on by the *Times*, and the whole exhibited the promptings of strong party feeling. In both cases the proceeding was prompted by political antipathy. Lord ALVANLEY knew

perfectly well, that O'CONNELL would not meet him in hostile combat. The exhibition was simply intended to lower the personal character of O'CONNELL, with the people of England. However, Mr. O'CONNELL's second son, MORGAN, who remained in London, was determined that the Noble Lord's conduct should not pass without notice, and he, immediately on the transaction at BROOKES's being known, addressed to him the following letter, and gave it in charge for delivery to his friend, Colonel HODGES.— We take the letter from Colonel HODGES' published statement, the whole of which, with the counter statement of Colonel DAMER, is too interesting to be omitted :—

“ 9, Clarges-street, Monday, May 4, 1835.

“ My Lord—Your Lordship thought proper to throw out grossly offensive expressions in the House of Lords on the 18th of last month, against my father, and indeed against the Irish Members generally in the Reform interest.

“ My father, on the 20th, retorted in the House of Commons, and in doing so, is supposed to have designated you as a ‘ bloated buffoon.’

“ My father remained two days in London without hearing anything from you on the subject. After his departure for Ireland, you appear to have made up your mind to send him a species of hostile communication.— You now state that this interval was occasioned by your having been in the country—but this matters not. I this day have read your letter, which it appears you have sent to the newspapers.

“ All the world knows that my father has been engaged in an unfortunate personal transaction—that he has publicly declared his determination never again to be similarly engaged ; and, therefore, that any man may so address him with safety and impunity.

“Although you were decidedly the aggressor—although you attributed unworthy and interested motives to him—although in your challenge, if it is to be considered one, you do not attempt to explain away the disrespectful expressions you had, in the first instance used towards him; although my father’s return to London would necessarily be in a few days—although but a few days elapsed after your sending this communication to Ireland—so few indeed, as scarcely to admit of the possibility of an answer; you or your friends, nevertheless, hastened to give publicity to the circumstance, and follow it up by canvassing for a requisition to BROOKES’S (at the head of which your own name, an interested party, most unbecomingly is placed) having for its object my father’s expulsion from that Club.

“Various insulting statements, grounded on the same circumstances, and obviously also emanating from the same source, went the round of the public papers devoted to your party. It was also even confidently rumoured by your partizans, that you proposed to assault my father, if he refused you satisfaction.

“Whether Mr. O’CONNELL will take any notice of your epistle, or treat it with the contempt it merits at his hands, is immaterial. He is ignorant of the miserable and paltry machinations going on in the Clubs of St. James’s-street.

“It is also immaterial whether these rumours and statements in the public prints, were or were not, unfounded, because you identified yourself with them, by permitting them repeatedly to appear without your denial.

“But all doubt on these points is at an end. Your letters have this day appeared in the newspapers, and your views are developed. It is now quite evident that your object, and that of those with whom you act, was

by no means that of obtaining the satisfaction which one gentleman may have a right to demand from another.

“Your object, in fact, in thus publicly parading your willingness to fight, was quite clearly neither more nor less than that of casting a stigma on my father; on the party of which I am one; and so, through us, to cast discredit on the measures we advocate, and on the Government of which we are the supporters.

“Thinking it right that the public should know the real character of this wretched manœuvre, and pitying or contemning some of those who, without being ostensibly of your faction, have weakly or basely lent themselves to it as your coadjutors, I have thought proper thus to explain briefly the case, together with its apparent and undoubted object, in order to prevent further mystification. And I have considered you the most fitting medium through whom to convey this succinct narrative to the public; but not, I confess, in the vain hope of inducing a man who I sincerely believe to have been appropriately designated by my father; and who, moreover, has been deliberately guilty, as I must conceive you to be, of this utterly ungentlemanly and braggadocio mode of carrying on party warfare—not, I repeat, in the vain hope of its inducing you to give me satisfaction, or to call upon me for a meeting.

“But still—lest I should wrong you in this surmise—not imitating your example in giving this communication immediate publicity, I will leave you intermediately a reasonable time, during which I have the honor to acquaint you that I am at your Lordship’s service; and to facilitate any such possibility, I have requested a friend to convey this to you.

“I have the honor to be, my Lord,

“Your Lordship’s most obedient humble servant,

“MORGAN O’CONNELL.”

“ This letter was presented to him at a quarter-past three in the afternoon of yesterday. Lord ALVANLEY stated that the gentleman, of whose assistance he intended to avail himself, was then at Woolwich, but that immediately after his return to London, he should call upon Colonel HODGES.

“ At half-past five Colonel DAMER DAWSON called upon Colonel HODGES, and stated that, although he took an entirely different view from that taken by Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL, yet Lord ALVANLEY was ready to give him an immediate meeting, and proposed that Col. HODGES should proceed with Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL to Arlington-street, where Col. DAMER DAWSON and Lord ALVANLEY should meet them, for the purpose of proceeding to a spot to be determined on for a hostile encounter. Accordingly, Colonel HODGES and Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL proceeded to Arlington-street, in a carriage; and finding Col. D. DAWSON and Lord ALVANLEY there, they agreed upon a meeting at a short distance beyond the turnpike, next the Regent's Park, on the Barnet road. On reaching the spot, Colonel HODGES stated to Col. D. DAWSON that, in order to relieve himself from all responsibility as to the results, he thought it his duty to declare that he was ready to recommend to his friend (Mr. O'CONNELL) to receive an apology from Lord ALVANLEY, for the part taken by him, in order to procure a meeting at BROOKES's, with a view to the expulsion of his father from that Club. Col. DAMER DAWSON replied, that Lord ALVANLEY came there to convince Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL that he was ready to put matters to that test, which Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL had intimated that Lord ALVANLEY was unwilling to do. Col. D. DAWSON then offered a paper to Col. HODGES, protesting against the proceeding of Mr. M. O'CONNELL, and disputing his right

to interfere. Col. HODGES refused to receive the protest and denied its admissibility. The ground was measured at 12 paces. It was agreed that Col. DAMER DAWSON should give the word, and that it should be "Ready, fire!" The parties were placed—the pistols were delivered. Col. DAWSON gave the words, and Mr. O'CONNELL fired. Lord ALVANLEY did not fire, and exclaimed that he thought the words were only given by way of preparation, and claimed the right to fire. Col. DAWSON agreed with Lord ALVANLEY; but Col. HODGES protested against such an interpretation being attached to the words, and insisted that Lord ALVANLEY, having omitted his opportunity, should not fire. Col. HODGES again demanded an apology, which being refused, pistols were again handed to the parties; and it having been agreed that Col. HODGES should give the word, both, on the signal being given, fired without effect. Colonel DAMER DAWSON asked whether Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL was satisfied; to which an answer in the negative was given by Col. HODGES. Colonel D. DAWSON then declared that he would agree to another exchange of fire, and in case of its being ineffectual, he would walk Lord ALVANLEY off the ground. The parties fired without effect, and Col. DAMER DAWSON, declaring that Lord ALVANLEY had proved to Mr. M. O'CONNELL that he was ready to meet him, walked him off the ground. It is but justice to Lord ALVANLEY to state, that from the moment he received Mr. O'CONNELL's letter, down to that in which he was walked by his friend off the ground, he exhibited a most manly, gentlemanlike, and gallant bearing. After the parties had left the ground, Lord ALVANLEY told Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL that although he (Lord ALVANLEY) had not fired on the first shot, he was convinced that Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL, had not taken any sort of advantage, and had acted with perfect fairness.

"G. LLOYD HODGES."

COLONEL DAMER'S STATEMENT.

“ 40, Upper Grosvenor-street,

“ Monday Evening, May 4.

“ On my arrival in London this evening at half-past five, from a review at Woolwich, Lord ALVANLEY put into my hands the following letter, which had been delivered to him by Col. HODGES, on the part of Mr. M. O'CONNELL.

“ meaning the letter from Mr. M. O'CONNELL.

“ Shortly after I had communicated with Lord ALVANLEY, I waited on Colonel HODGES at the Junior United Service Club. Having obtained an interview with him, I formally protested against the course Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL had thought proper to pursue; but at the same time, informed Colonel HODGES, that Lord ALVANLEY was ready to meet Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL *immediately*.

“ Col. HODGES asked whether it should be this evening or to-morrow. I replied this evening. Colonel HODGES then acceded to my proposal, and added, that as it was but half-past six o'clock, there would be still plenty of light.

“ We then separated, and returning to our respective principals, accompanied them a short distance out of town.

“ As we were proceeding from our carriages to the ground, Colonel HODGES took me aside, and expressed his desire that the affair should be amicably settled. He observed—‘ We are come here to receive an apology from Lord ALVANLEY; he has caused a requisition to be presented to the managers of BROOKES's, urging them to turn Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL out of that Club.’ I replied, that he could not have read the requisition, for that it only required the managers to call a general meeting of the Club. I then recalled to the recollection of Col.

HODGES the protest I had verbally made, when I had previously seen him, and I presented him with a written statement to the same effect. This Colonel HODGES refused to accept; and he said that Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL came there to demand satisfaction for the insult offered to his father by the requisition made to BROOKES'S. I then declared that Lord ALVANLEY'S quarrel was with Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL, and not with his son; but that as Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL had thought proper to write to him to intimate his conviction that Lord ALVANLEY would be afraid to meet him, I had brought Lord ALVANLEY to the ground, to prove the contrary; I again tendered my protest.

“ The ground having been measured, and the parties placed at a distance of 12 paces from one another, Mr. O'CONNELL'S pistols were placed in their hands.

“ Col. HODGES and myself agreed that I should give the signal to fire, and that it should be—‘ Make ready ! Fire ! ’ I was proceeding to instruct the gentlemen concerned as to the signals that were to be their guide, and had said, ‘ Gentlemen, I shall use the following words— ‘ Make ready ! Fire ! ’ when Mr. O'CONNELL, thinking that I had given the signal, through mistake discharged his pistol. I had then a short discussion with Colonel HODGES, as to the light in which that shot was to be considered, when Lord ALVANLEY desired me to waive the right I conceived he had to return the fire.

“ We proceeded to load again, and shots were exchanged without effect. I then asked Col. HODGES whether he and his principal were satisfied? The Colonel replied that they were not; that they still demanded an apology for the letter to BROOKE'S. Here I felt a deep responsibility, and that my situation was one of great embarrassment; my first impression was, that I was

bound not to allow Lord ALVANLEY to be made answerable to one man for a quarrel with another, and that his having proved to Mr. M. O'CONNELL, by having received two shots from him, how unfounded was his assertion that Lord ALVANLEY was unwilling to meet him, I was then called upon to put a stop to the proceeding, by taking him off the ground. But on second thoughts, I judged it more desirable to allow the affair to go on one step further, to prevent the possibility of any misrepresentation of the subject.

“ After another exchange of shots, without effect, I withdrew Lord ALVANLEY from the field, without his having made any apology to Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL, or any withdrawal of what he had said respecting Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL.

“ As we were leaving the ground, Mr. O'CONNELL said to me, Colonel DAMER, I give you my honour that I fired that shot by mistake; on which Lord ALVANLEY approached and said he was satisfied Mr. O'CONNELL had done so.

“ GEORGE DAWSON DAMER.”

There appears to have been some difference of opinion as to whether the signal was given or not, when Mr. O'CONNELL first fired; to remove any erroneous impression on the subject, the following statement, apparently authorised, appeared, a few days after, in the *Morning Chronicle* :—

“ We understand that the statements published, though correct as far as they go, do not contain some particulars which may serve to explain how one party fired before the other. Lord ALVANLEY and Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL were put on their ground, and the pistols, cocked and feathered, delivered to them by their seconds. It was then agreed to, that the words should be—“ ready, fire”—to be given by Colonel DAWSON

DAMER, at his own desire. Mr. O'CONNELL then asked "As there are to be two words, at which am I to raise my pistol?" "At the word fire," replied Colonel DAMER. "Very well," said Mr. O'CONNELL, "I only asked for information." The seconds then withdrew on both sides, when Colonel DAMER said distinctly, and without any preparatory word, "Ready—fire!" upon which Mr. O'CONNELL fired. It has been said that Colonel DAMER was merely repeating his instructions. This may be so; but who was to suppose, after the ground had been measured, the principals put on their positions, and the seconds had withdrawn, that Colonel DAWSON DAMER would go through a fresh rehearsal? It is impossible to know Colonel DAMER's intentions; but Mr. O'CONNELL could draw no other conclusion from his act than what he did draw. A discussion arose after Mr. O'CONNELL had fired, in consequence of Lord ALVANLEY's claiming his right to fire; but he subsequently relinquished his right. After the discussion had terminated, Colonel HODGES said, "Colonel DAMER, there now shall be no mistake, I'll give the word." Col. DAMER replied, "Very well." With the subsequent occurrences the public are already acquainted."

When it was found that Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL stood forward in defence of his father, another plan of attack was set on foot, by making the son accountable for any personal expressions used by O'CONNELL. It appears that Mr. D'ISRAELI, on the hustings at Taunton, where he was a defeated candidate, had attacked O'CONNELL, with a sarcastic bitterness, of which the world now knows he is capable. This, of course, was not passed over by the LIBERATOR, and, accordingly, we find in the proceedings of the Dublin Franchise Association, a speech of his, in which the following passage occurs:—

“Yet, Sir, the “No-Popery” cry is again raised in England, and every enemy to Ireland in that country does me the honour of directing the arrows of his malevolence against me. But I have risen to a magnitude I never thought I would attain, by the quantity of slander poured out upon me, through the medium of the English press. They make me a bug-bear of the first magnitude, though any bug of my size would be a humbug—but literally, nothing is more ludicrous than the importance which they attach to my humble name. I am not accustomed to feel much surprised at their resorting to me for “lack of argument,” but I must confess, there is one of the attacks on me, which excites in my mind a great deal of astonishment. It is this—the attack lately made at Taunton, by Mr. D’ISRAELI. In the annals of political turpitude, there is not any thing deserving the appellation of ‘blackguardism,’ to equal that attack upon me. What is my acquaintance with this man? Just this. In 1831, or the beginning of 1832, the Borough of Wickham became vacant; I then knew him, but not personally. I knew him merely as the author of one or two novels. He got an introduction to me, and wrote me a letter, stating, that, as I was a Radical Reformer, and as he was also a Radical, and was going to stand upon the Radical interest for the Borough of Wickham, where he said there were many persons of that way of thinking, who would be influenced by my opinion, he would feel obliged by receiving a letter from me, recommendatory of him, as a Radical. His letter to me was so distinct upon the subject, that I immediately complied with the request, and composed as good an epistle as I could in his behalf. I am in the habit of letter-writing, Sir, and Mr. D’ISRAELI thought this letter so valuable, that he not only took the autograph, but had it printed and placarded. It was, in fact, the ground upon which he canvassed the Borough. He

was, however, defeated, but that was not my fault—I did not demand gratitude from him ; but I think, if he had any feeling of his own, he would conceive I had done him, a civility at least, if not a service, which ought not to be repaid by atrocity of the foulest description. The next thing I heard of him was, that he had started upon the Radical interest for Mary-le-bone, but was again defeated. Having been twice defeated on the Radical interest, he was just the fellow for the Conservatives, and accordingly he joined a Conservative club, and started for two or three places on the Conservative interest. How is he now engaged ? Why, in abusing the Radicals, and eulogising the King and the Church, like a true Conservative. At Taunton, this miscreant had the audacity to style me an incendiary ! Why, I was a greater incendiary in 1831 than I am at present, if I ever were one—and if I am, he is doubly so, for having employed me. Then he calls me a traitor. My answer to that is—he is a liar.— He is a liar in action and in words. His life is a living lie. He is a disgrace to his species. What taste of society must that be, that could tolerate such a creature, having the audacity to come forward with one set of principles at one time, and obtain political assistance by reason of those principles—and at another, to profess diametrically the reverse ? His life, I say again, is a living lie. He is the most degraded of his species and kind ; and England is degraded in tolerating, or having, upon the face of her society, a miscreant of his abominable, foul, and atrocious nature. My language is harsh, and I owe an apology for it ; but I will tell you why I owe that apology. It is for this reason, that if there be harsher terms in the British language, I should use them ; because it is the harshest of all terms that would be descriptive of a wretch of his species. He is just the fellow for the Conservative Club. I suppose if

Sir R. PEEL had been out of the way, when he was called upon to take office, this fellow would have undertaken to supply his place. He has falsehood enough, depravity enough, and selfishness enough, to become the fitting leader of the Conservatives. He is Conservatism personified. His name shows he is by descent a Jew. His father became a convert. He is the better for that in this world ; and I hope, of course, he will be the better for it in the next. There is a habit of underrating that great and oppressed nation—the Jews. They are cruelly persecuted by persons calling themselves Christians—but no person ever yet was a christian who persecuted. The cruelest persecution they suffer is upon their character, by the foul names which their calumniators bestowed upon them, before they carried their atrocities into effect. They feel the persecution of calumny severer upon them than the persecution of actual force, and the tyranny of actual torture. I have the happiness to be acquainted with some Jewish families in London, and, amongst them, more accomplished ladies, or more humane, cordial, high-minded, or better educated gentlemen, I have never met. It will not be supposed, therefore, that when I speak of D'ISRAELI as the descendant of a Jew, that I mean to tarnish him on that account. They were once the chosen people of God. There were miscreants amongst them, however, also ; and it must have certainly been from one of those that D'ISRAELI descended. He possesses just the qualities of the impenitent thief who died upon the cross ; whose name, I verily believe, must have been D'ISRAELI. For aught I know, the present D'ISRAELI is descended from him, and with the impression that he is, I now forgive the heir-at-law of the blasphemous thief who died upon the cross.'

When D'ISRAELI found that MORGAN O'CONNELL was ready to sustain his father, he convinced himself that it

was quite within the established rules of honor to shoot at, and, it may be, kill the son, because of the biting sarcasm of the father. Accordingly, he addressed Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL the following letter :—

“ 31, A, Park-street, Grosvenor-square,
Tuesday, May 5, 1835.

“ SIR—As you have established yourself as the champion of your father, I have the honour to request your notice to a very scurrilous attack which your father has made upon my conduct and character.

“ Had Mr. O'CONNELL, according to the practice observed among gentlemen, appealed to me respecting the accuracy of the reported expressions, before he indulged in offensive comments upon them, he would, if he can be influenced by a sense of justice, have felt that such comments were unnecessary. He has not thought fit to do so, and he leaves me no alternative but to request that you, his son, will resume your vicarious duties of yielding satisfaction for the insults, which your father has too long lavished, with impunity, upon his political opponents.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

“ B. D'ISRAELI.

“ MORGAN O'CONNELL, Esq., M. P.”

To this, Mr. O'CONNELL sent by Mr. FITZSTEPHEN FRENCH, the following reply :—

“ 9, Clarges-street, Tuesday, May 5, 1835.

“ SIR—I have this day received a letter from you, stating that a scurrilous attack has been made on you by my father, without giving me any information as to the expressions complained of, or when or where they were used, and which I now hear of for the first time.

“ I deny your right to call upon me in the present instance, and I am not answerable for what my father may say. I called on Lord ALVANLEY for satisfaction,

because I conceived he had purposely insulted my father, by calling a meeting at BROOKES'S for the purpose of expelling him the Club, he being, at the time, absent in Ireland.

“ When I deny you a right to call on me in the present instance, I also beg leave most unequivocally to deny your right to address an insulting letter to me, who am almost personally unknown to you, and unconscious of having ever given you the slightest offence. I must therefore request that you will withdraw your letter, as without that it will be impossible for me to enter into an explanation.

“ I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,
“ MORGAN O'CONNELL.

“ B. D'ISRAELI, Esq.”

The correspondence was closed by the following :—

31, A, Park-street, Tuesday, May 5.

“ SIR—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, delivered to me by Mr. FITZSTEPHEN FRENCH, by which I learn, that you do not consider yourself answerable for what your father may say.

“ With regard to your request that I should withdraw my letter, because its character is insulting to yourself, I have to observe that it is not in my power to withdraw the letter which states the reason of my application; but I have no hesitation in assuring you, that I did not intend that it should convey to you any personal insult.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,
“ B. D'ISRAELI.

“ I feel it my duty to publish the correspondence.”

Being thus disappointed in receiving redress from another, for the injury done him by Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. D'ISRAELI then published the following letter :—

“ TO MR. DANIEL O’CONNELL, M.P. FOR DUBLIN.

“ London, May 5.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL—Although you have placed yourself out of the pale of civilization, still I am one who will not be insulted, even by a yahoo, without chastising it. When I read this morning, in the same journals, your virulent attack upon myself, and that your son was, at the same moment, paying the penalty of similar virulence to another individual, on whom you had dropped your filth, I thought that the consciousness that your opponents had at length discovered a source of satisfaction, might have animated your insolence to unwonted energy; and I called upon your son to re-assume his vicarious office of yielding satisfaction for his shrinking sire. But it seems that gentleman declines the further exercise of the pleasing duty of enduring the consequences of your libertine harangues. I have no other means, therefore, of noticing your effusion, but this public mode. Listen, then, to me.

“ If it had been possible for you to act like a gentleman, you would have hesitated before you made your foul and insolent comments, upon a hasty and garbled report of a speech, which scarcely contains a sentence or an expression as they emanated from my mouth; but the truth is, you were glad to seize the first opportunity of pouring forth your venom against a man, whom it serves the interest of your party to represent as a political apostate.

“ In 1831, when Mr. O’CONNELL expressed to the electors of Wycombe his anxiety to assist me in my election; I came forward as the opponent of the party in power, and which I described in my address as “rapacious, tyrannical, and incapable of action”—the English Whigs, who, in the ensuing year, denounced you as a traitor, from the throne; and every one of whom, only a few months back, you have anathematised with all the peculiar graces of a

tongue practised in scurrility. You are the patron of these men now, Mr. O'CONNELL; you, forsooth, are 'devoted' to them. Which of us is the most consistent.

" You say that I was once a Radical, and now that I am a Tory. My conscience acquits me of ever having deserted a political friend, or ever having changed a political opinion. I worked for a great and avowed end in 1831, and that was the restoration of the balance of parties in the state; a result which I believed to be necessary to the honour of the realm and the happiness of the people. I never advocated a measure which I did not believe tended to that result, and if there be any measures which I then urged, and now am not disposed to press, it is because that great result is obtained.

" In 1831, I should have been very happy to have laboured for the object with Mr. O'CONNELL, with whom I had no personal acquaintance; but who was a member of the Legislature, remarkable for his political influence, his versatile talents, and his intense hatred and undisguised contempt of the Whigs.

" Since 1831, we have met only once, but I have a lively recollection of my interview with so distinguished a personage. Our conversation was of great length; I had a very ample opportunity of studying your character. I thought you a very amusing, a very interesting, but a somewhat overrated man. I am sure, on that occasion, I did not disguise from you my political views; I spoke with a frankness which I believe is characteristic of my disposition. I told you I was not a sentimental, but a practical politician; that what I chiefly desired to see was the formation of a strong, but constitutional Government, that would maintain the empire; and that I thought if the Whigs remained in office, they would shipwreck the State. I observed then, as was my habit, that the Whigs must be got rid of at any price. It seemed to me that you were much

of the same opinion as myself; but our conversation was very general. We formed no political alliance, and for a simple reason—I concealed, neither from yourself, nor from your friends, the Repeal of the Union was an impassable gulf between us; and that I could not comprehend, after the announcement of such an intention, how any English party could co-operate with you. Probably, you then thought that the English movement might confederate with you on a system of mutual assistance, and that you might exchange and circulate your accommodation measures of destruction; but even Mr. O'CONNELL, with his lively faith in Whig feebleness and Whig dishonesty, could scarcely have imagined that, in the course of 12 months, his fellow-conspirators were to be my Lord MELBOURNE and the Marquess of LANSDOWNE.

“ I admire your scurrilous allusions to my origin. It is quite clear that the ‘hereditary bondsman’ has already forgotten the clank of his fetter. I know the tactics of your church; it clamours for toleration, and it labours for supremacy. I see that you are quite prepared to persecute.

“ With regard to your taunts, as to my want of success in my election contests, permit me to remind you that I had nothing to appeal to but the good sense of the people. No threatening skeletons canvassed for me; a death's-head and cross-bones were not blazoned on my banners. My pecuniary resources, too, were limited; I am not one of those public beggars that we see swarming with their obtrusive boxes in the chapels of your creed; nor am I in possession of a princely revenue wrung from a starving race of fanatical slaves. Nevertheless, I have a deep conviction that the hour is at hand when I shall be more successful, and take my place in that proud assembly, of which Mr. O'CONNELL avows his wish no longer to be a member. I expect to be a representative of the people

before the Repeal of the Union—We shall meet at Philippi; and rest assured that, confident in a good cause, and in some energies which have been not altogether unproved, I will seize the first opportunity of inflicting upon you a castigation which will make you, at the same time, remember and repent the insults that you have lavished upon

“ BENJAMIN D'ISRAELI.”

After this letter to Mr. O'CONNELL appeared in the papers, the following correspondence took place, which no unprejudiced mind can consider creditable to D'ISRAELI:

“ 31, A. Park-st., Grosvenor-square, May 6, 1835.

“ SIR—Not having been favoured with your reply to my second letter of yesterday, I thought fit to address a letter to your father—and for this reason, I deduce from your communication, delivered by Mr. FRENCH, that you do not consider yourself responsible for any insults offered by your father, but only bound to resent the insults which he may receive. Now, Sir, it is my hope that I have insulted him; assuredly it was my intention to do so. I wished to express the utter scorn in which I hold his character, and the disgust with which his conduct inspires me. If I failed in conveying this expression of my feelings to him, let me more successfully express them now to you. I shall take every opportunity of holding your father's name up to public contempt, and I fervently pray that you, or some one of his blood, may attempt to avenge the unextinguishable hatred with which I shall pursue his existence.—I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

“ B. D'ISRAELI.

“ MORGAN O'CONNELL, Esq., M.P.”

“ Thursday, May 7, 1835.

“ SIR—I have this moment received your letter of the 6th inst. which was left at Clarges-street, during my absence, at half-past eleven last night. Your letter of the

5th inst., in which you declare that you "did not intend to convey to me any personal insult," followed by a publication, of which you gave me notice, induced me to think that the matter was concluded between us; the tenor of your last letter is such, that it is impossible for me to renew the correspondence.

"In the postscript of your letter of the 5th instant, you state that you feel it your duty to publish the correspondence; in accordance with that view, I send your last communication and my reply to the Press.

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

"MORGAN O'CONNELL.

"B. D'ISRAELI, Esq."

Thus terminated, nearly at the same time, two affairs of honor, in which Mr. MORGAN O'CONNELL acquitted himself, not only with spirit and courage, but, also, with good sense and honorable bearing. He, unquestionably, had the advantage, in public opinion, of both gentlemen.

These events obliged Mr. O'CONNELL to return to London, though he was anxious to remain in Ireland, to do honor to Lord MULGRAVE, on his arrival. Speaking, at the Franchise Association of these transactions, he says:

"Events have occurred, which I would have prevented if I could, that render it more than necessary, that make it my duty to be there; and, perhaps, I may be permitted to say, I never injured any man, to whom I was not perfectly ready to make reparation to the fullest extent of my power, if he required it. No man ever said I injured him, that I did not anxiously and zealously investigate if the charge were true, and most completely satisfy my mind on the subject. I feel that I never offended any man without sufficient provocation. If I should do so, that man had only to ask, and there is no atonement he would require, that I am not ready to make. But while I am ready to atone for every unprovoked offence,

and to obviate every injury, I am neither afraid or ashamed to avow, that I look with the utmost abhorrence on the practice of duelling; and would rather descend to be reckoned the most abject of human beings, than attempt to defend, directly or indirectly, that violation against the law of God. Is that a reason, when I am outraged as a public man, that I am not to express my opinion of the person who outraged me? I don't use it as a protection against atoning for any injury or offence I may give, and which ought not to be given; and I confess I don't think it will be a protection for any other man to pour out the viol of his wrath upon me, to have described that man as he ought to be. Why now I will just take the case of D'ISRAELI. He was under an obligation to me: he asked a favor, obtained it, and wrote a letter expressive of his gratitude, but he never showed any; and the next thing I heard was, that at a public meeting he called me an incendiary and a traitor. Is there any reason why I would not describe that man as he deserved? Mr. O'CONNELL here entered into an explanation respecting Col. DAMER's letter. He said he did not receive it until the 29th, not having been sent to the Post Office from some place called the Traveller's Club, in London, until the 27th; and that on the next day, the 30th, he got a second letter, dated 28th, which expressed great surprise at his not answering the letter which he did not receive until the 29th. By that accident, his (Mr. O'C.'s) answer did not arrive until the 4th, having written it on the 1st of May, which was Friday. Mr. O'CONNELL next alluded to the two English Catholics, whose names remained on the requisition at BROOKES's, and commented upon their ingratitude in so doing; for what would they be but slaves, were it not that he, supported by the people, had obtained their emancipation. He also alluded to the act of the Cisalpine Club, that invited him to become a member, and then black-

beaned him—which was a kind of political club established to procure emancipation. These things did not look like a combination of Catholics to destroy the Protestants.”

The following, of the many humorous squibs written about this time, will show the excitement which the ALVANLEY affair created. It is, moreover, like one of H. B.'s caricatures—a portrait, though, of course, exaggerated :—

“ THE BLOATED BUFFOON.”

“ Some sing of the Queen, and some sing of the King,
Some of Courtiers and Courts, and all that sort of thing ;
And some, like O'ROURKE, of the man in the moon,
But I'll sing to the praise of the Bloated Buffoon.

“ He's the Solon of statesmen, the Falstaff of wits,
As even O'C——LL in candour admits ;
He's the pride of the Park, of the Club, the Saloon,
For the wag of all wags is the Bloated Buffoon.

“ Hook and Hood, are first-rate at extorting a laugh,
But the one is a donkey, the other a calf ;
And the Marquess himself, but a silly *gorsoon*
Compared with that wonder, the Bloated Buffoon.

“ The instant he makes his first bow at the door,
The party is sure to go off in a roar ;
Each cheek swells with laughter, just like a balloon,
So resistlessly droll is the Bloated Buffoon !

“ When he writes, his verse beats even BLACKMORE'S and
DERRICK'S ;
When he smiles, all the ladies drop down in hysterics ;
When he puns, you would swear that an Indian monsoon
Was shouting in praise of the Bloated Buffoon.

“ Irresistible wag ! all at B—k—s's agree
That GRIMALDI and LISTON are nothing to thee ;
And that, take the whole season, from Easter to June,
There's no treat like the jokes of the Bloated Buffoon.

“ Then long may those jokes, like the almond-tree, thrive,
To keep the old glories of folly alive ;
And long—but enough, I must finish my tune,
So hip, hip, hurrah, for the Bloated Buffoon !”

In connexion with those transactions, and, indeed, with the unprecedented position which O'CONNELL then held in the eyes of the empire, "the observed of all observers, the *Morning Chronicle*, has the following most admirable remarks :—

"It is amusing to observe the variety of shapes under which Mr. O'CONNELL's name and deeds have been lately introduced, by the Tory scribes, to the notice of the public. II. B. immortalises the "Great Agitator," one day, as a kangaroo—on the next, as the wolf that devoured *Little Red Riding Hood*, the next, as *Friar Tuck*, the next, as the disturber of the peace and the dinner of *Sancho Panza*. In the *Anti-Times*, DAN figures as a standing dish every morning. We verily believe that the new readers of that imbecile journal, could not breakfast comfortably, unless they might preface a slice or two of bacon with a cut out of O'CONNELL. He is a 'robber,' because, having given up a lucrative profession for the service of his country, that country compensates him for losses which, if they were to fall upon his family, would necessarily prevent him from taking a seat in parliament. He is a 'poltroon,' because, having retaliated in the House of Commons, the abuse which was lavished upon him in the Lords, he will not go to Chalk farm to shoot Lord ALVANLEY or Mr. D'ISRAELI, or be shot by either of these champions of the defeated faction. In a country boasting of its monopoly of all the true religious feeling to be found on this globe of ours, a man is abused in all quarters, high and low, in the pulpit, in the club, in the streets, wherever a preacher can collect a mob around him, in the palace of the bishop, in the cottage of the curate, because he will not bathe his hands in the blood of a fellow-creature. An individual, thus abused on every side, is not permitted to complain, or if he does, he gives provocation which he is bound to answer with

his life, and by a violation of the most solemn of all laws.

“The necessity of pouring out a daily discharge of bile upon Mr. O’CONNELL, seems absolutely indispensable to the literary health of the *Standard*. The poor *Post*, and the ‘impartial’ *Herald*—impartial, because no section of the political world thinks its support anything but injury; and it is, therefore, the organ only of the old women—carry on a diurnal duet of which O’CONNELL is, in every sense of the word, the burden; that is to say, he really weighs down their puny voices—he is too big for the utterance of such drivellers. DAY and MARTIN, and the renowned TURNER, have a fine time of it; they have increased the sale of their blacking about five thousand pots per week, by merely prefixing to their usual puffs an ingenious invective against O’CONNELL.—A man obtained a patent the other day for a new mode of sending people to sleep, without using any of the usual narcotics for that purpose. He declares that when Mr. O’CONNELL returns to London, he will silence the representative of ‘all Ireland,’ by this wonderful invention, which will lay the head of the ‘tail’ and even the ‘tail’ itself prostrate on the benches, whenever it may be found necessary to paralyse that dangerous instrument of revolution. Mr. D’ISRAELI has, indeed, announced another lethargic mode of operating against his former Radical ally, which differs from the one just described only in this way, that it is to be applied to the house in general, instead of the agitator himself. While the operations of the ‘impenitent,’ as he is now called, are going on, DAN is to be alive and elegantly exeruciated, while the other members of the house are to be wrapped in the most profound sleep.

“It was but the other day that the Hibernian monster was compared by the new organ of the church to the

Indian serpent, which the poor natives adore because the poison of its fang is fatal. This was a very droll simile, for it so happens that, in Ireland, the sacred animal is worshipped—if worshipped he be—because he has delivered the country from the reptiles that really were poisonous; the vampires that drank the best blood from her veins. If the serpent be the emblem of wisdom in the east, Mr. O'CONNELL may be contented with the appellation.

What folly it is in all these foul-mouthed slanderers not to see, that, in the person of Mr. O'CONNELL, are concentrated all the wrongs of Ireland, and that, by making him of so much importance, they are placing those wrongs in so conspicuous a point of view, magnified by the light thus thrown upon them, it will be impossible for this country any longer to permit their continuance. We are told, from day to day, that O'CONNELL is the ruler of the Government. In a certain sense, this assertion cannot be denied; for the evils which have so long afflicted that country, have become so enormous and so embarrassing, and have given Mr. O'CONNELL such overwhelming powers, that he will rule Ireland, and every Government that may be established in Ireland, until those evils shall have been completely redressed. It was absurd to speak of the terms which he was said to have made with the Ministry. Such a man need make no stipulations with any Cabinet whatever. While he derives authority from the sufferings of his countrymen, no Minister can resist it, except by removing all the grievances from which it springs. Very many of his enemies would rejoice to hear that O'CONNELL had fallen in combat, no matter with whom, or that he had been drowned in the Irish Channel. If either event were unhappily to occur, a new O'CONNELL would be found the very next day, as mighty as the first of the dynasty,

in the thousand oppressions under which Ireland has been, for centuries, and is still, bowed to the dust.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL has at least this consolation to cheer him through all the difficulties which are now so industriously thrown in his way. He is acknowledged, even by his bitterest foes, to be one of the most perfect masters of eloquence that have ever appeared in Parliament—a matchless tactician in debate—an unrivalled lawyer in the noble sense of the word, who has made himself conversant with all the niceties of the science, that he might offer up his acquirements at the shrine of his country. We are aware that his power is great—greater than a subject has ever yet wielded in this or any other country, and that too of a nature wholly irresponsible. It was our advice, and we repeat it, that as Mr. O’CONNELL’s authority, which supersedes that of the King, cannot be taken away, or even impaired, until the grievances which have produced it shall have been redressed, he ought to have been made responsible for its exercise, by being placed in some important office. But, the Tories would leave him the power without the responsibility ; they are the party who have created the power by their misrule ; and yet if it were reduced within the jurisdiction of the constitution, they would cry out that the constitution was destroyed. But they are governed by their passions ; their sordid interests are to them of more value than the peace of Ireland, or the constitution of the empire.”

Nothing could exceed the anxiety to wound, in every possible way, the Government, through the sides of the Catholics and of O’CONNELL. In the first place, a crusade against the religion of Ireland, was organised, and set in operation. The Rev. MORTIMER O’SULLIVAN, a reformed Clergyman, was the most prominent of the crusaders ! Mr. SHEIL said of him, truly and terse-

ly, "that he had all the advantages of the pleasures of Memory on the one hand, and of the pleasures of Hope on the other—Memory carried him back to the days when he was a Roman Catholic, Hope pointed to the good things in store, for services, now to be rendered the Orange and Conservative cause." In 1835, both names meant the same thing. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN was a man of a very high order of talent. He was a truly eloquent man, had a complete mastery over his subject, and his language was fluent and lucid, without being ornate. As a leader in this religious crusade, he was most efficient. The next was the Rev. Mr. M'GHEE, a very prejudiced, and, as we will see in the course of this Memoir, by no means a scrupulous religious agitator. The third was the Scotch Captain GORDON, of whom we have already written, at the period when he made so distinguished a figure, at the Biblical meeting in Cork. He was afterwards returned to Parliament by Lord RODEN, for the Borough of Dundalk. There he attempted to make some display of bigotry, but was not encouraged. He was kept too in check by the dread of O'CONNELL's sledge-hammer. We lose sight of him after the passing of the Reform Bill, until, in 1835, we find him agitating in Scotland, with MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN and M'GHEE.

They got possession of the work of an old Catholic theological writer, named PETER DENS, a very obscure author, of whom no one ever heard, until these scrupulous gentlemen gave, to the English public, a translation of his work from the original latin. In this book were instructions to ecclesiastics to enable them to understand the human heart in its most depraved and vicious state; so that, in the confessional, the priest might understand, and be able to advise the once most abandoned profligate, if he disburthened his conscience, and sought restora-

tion to moral life, through penance and contrition.— It is clear, that such a book as that was never intended to meet the public eye, and that the publication of selected passages, was a sin against virtue and morality. It is equally clear, that in reading works having allusion to the frailties of mankind, the sin and profligacy are in the intention with which they are perused—if, for the purpose of gratifying vile passions, then the perusal is an abomination—if, on the other hand, they are read with the view to check the crimes which they unfold, and that the knowledge of abomination is acquired with pain and disgust, just as a surgeon acquires an intimacy with his profession, through the horrors and effluvia of a dissecting room—for the purpose of turning that knowledge to the advantage of religion, then such a study is necessary and called for. This distinction was not regarded by the religious crusaders we have mentioned—PETER DENNS was brought to light—particular passages published, commented on, and read, even as HARIETT WILSON'S memoirs were read, by the universal public. Was this conduct right, religious, moral? No; but what cared the collators, when the object was to raise a “no-Popery” cry in England. The crusade commenced, and, to a considerable extent, these gentlemen were successful. They found an enormous amount of bigotry in the country, and fostered, and made it more violent. Again, when it was found that neither the ALVANLEY nor the D'ISRAELI affair personally damaged O'CONNELL, they propagated the statement, that he said nineteen women, out of every twenty in England, bore children before marriage. This caused, naturally enough, a very great feeling against him. But it soon came out that this statement was made by an English Protestant Clergyman, and that Mr. O'CONNELL, in one of his speeches, we believe, against poor laws, quoted the observations of the

clergyman. All these devices to raise a religious and anti-Irish cry, failed, except in the rural districts, and we shall see shortly how triumphantly O'CONNELL was received throughout England and Scotland, in the month of September, 1835, notwithstanding these disgraceful efforts to prejudice the people against him. Indeed, in consequence of O'CONNELL's efforts on behalf of Municipal Reform, in England, there never before existed so strong a feeling in favor of Ireland, and this was one of the reasons why the Irish LIBERATOR became so decided in his policy of trying the experiment of getting justice without Repeal. But the feeling passed away, and he had, at the end, to return to what ought never have been given up—to the Repeal Agitation—to obtain the means of national prosperity.

In Ireland, too, the highest state of feeling existed amongst the Orangemen. Mr. Recorder SHAW, a judge of the land, at a public dinner, called those, differing with him in politics, "revolutionists," and "infidels in their religion." When the Roman Catholics assembled at the Corn Exchange, in Dublin, to repel this insult, they found the room pre-occupied, and the meeting chiefly composed of Orangemen, so determined and violent was then the spirit of that faction. The Catholics retired, and afterwards held a meeting at the Coburg Gardens, where precautions were taken to prevent the meeting being disturbed. The Dublin Coal Porters, or, as they were styled, "the boys of the Quay," formed a kind of police, and Mr. THOMAS REYNOLDS, and other members of the Trades' Union endeavoured with their assistance to keep order. But they were not long permitted to remain quiet. The Rev. JOHNNY M'CREE appeared there, and endeavoured to excite an angry feeling, by crying out from the hustings, at a Catholic meeting, "no-Popery."

He then retired, and, in a very short time afterwards, three or four hundred Orangemen forced their way into the gardens. Then a collision took place, and some blows were given. THOMAS REYNOLDS was prosecuted, and sentenced to NINE MONTHS' IMPRISONMENT! Such was the alarming spirit which was then springing up amongst the Orangemen. We shall shortly see, when we come to speak of the next proceedings of that body, what it was that was then in the contemplation of many of them.

The sentence on REYNOLDS caused a great sensation throughout the country. Lord MULGRAVE was not the man to pass it over without inquiry. He called for the judge's report—it was not favorable. He examined into the case, and, without a moment's hesitation, enlarged Mr. REYNOLDS. O'CONNELL, at a dinner in Tralee in 1836, speaking of him says:—

“ Look to Lord MULGRAVE's conduct in the case of REYNOLDS, who was tried by Judge DOHERTY—and while I am on the subject, I must say that it is impossible the newspaper reports of that trial can be true—I cannot believe them to be correct; for in a case where the very police officers were the witnesses called by REYNOLDS, who swore that he was trying to preserve the peace, and how Judge DOHERTY or Judge SMITH, could omit to send that fact to the Jury, I cannot conceive; or how the Jury could convict any one under such circumstances, I cannot imagine. But Lord MULGRAVE, the man of personal courage in Jamaica, without any application, at least, in my belief, dismissed REYNOLDS from gaol. I was considering whether, as member for Dublin, I was not bound to make application for his discharge. Yet I did not; and I am sure REYNOLDS did not; for a braver creature does not exist, or a better-hearted Irish-

man than he is. No, I said to myself, ' I much mistake human nature, if I am deceived in Lord MULGRAVE: if it be right that it be done, he will do it.' I was right in my estimate of him—the fearlessly brave Lord MULGRAVE sent REYNOLDS home from gaol."

While the Conservative party were thus, outside doors, endeavouring to damage, through Mr. O'CONNELL, the Whig Government, they, at the same time, adopted such an obstructive policy in Parliament, as would, they hoped, impede all reforms, until they had themselves had every opportunity, by a return to power, of carrying out their own views. Sir ROBERT PEEL had announced, at a great dinner given him at Merchant Taylors' Hall, that the battle of the constitution was to be fought at the registry—that it was vain to think the House of Lords could continue to resist the declared wishes of the Commons—that, in fine, the lower House was the governing body of the State, and that it was there a majority was to be acquired in order to obtain Conservative ascendancy. This advice was zealously followed by his party with triumphant effect. Pending this struggle for power at the registries, the obstructive power of the House of Lords was set in motion. The measures introduced this Session by the Government were the Church Bill—the English Corporation Bill—Irish Corporation Reform, and a new Irish Registration Bill. In tracing these measures, we shall, at once, discover the policy of the Conservatives, to which we have been referring. The Church Bill enacted, that the Clergy should be paid £72 10s. 0d. for every hundred pounds income derived from the Tithe Composition, to be secured by a permanent rent-charge as a first charge on the inheritance, in the same manner as the £75 proposed by PEEL's Government. It further enacted, that, after the death of the present incumbents, in every

parish, where there were not fifty Protestants, the living should be sequestered; and, in every case, where the living exceeded three hundred pounds a year, the Church Commissioners should certify to the Lord Lieutenant, the state of the Parish, and the amount of duties to be performed. According to such duties, the future income of the living was to be regulated, and the surplus was, then, to be appropriated to the moral and religious education of the people, without distinction of creed. This surplus, which was estimated at about sixty thousand a-year, would, clearly, not arise for a long series of years. But the principle it involved of appropriating, as Parliament deemed fit, the Church property was the great cause of contention. Sir ROBERT PEEL proposed that the measure should be divided into two bills—one regulating the future payment of the Clergy's incomes—and the other carrying out the reduction and sequestration of livings, and the future appropriation of any surplus. On this motion, as an amendment to Lord MORPETH'S, a lengthened debate arose, and, being a grand party one, was, of course, adjourned. The Government, on a division, carried their proposition by a majority of thirty-seven—or, in other words, Sir ROBERT PEEL'S amendment was lost. It was during this debate that O'CONNELL raised such a shout of ridicule against Mr. WALTER, proprietor of the *Times*, and then member for Berkshire. He was still in the habit, though what was called a neutral Conservative, of sitting on the Ministerial side of the House, though the rest of his section had gone over to the opposition side with STANLEY. He had spoken during the debate from his usual place. Mr. O'CONNELL, after dealing heavily with the arguments of Sir JAMES GRAHAM, was about to direct his attention to what had fallen from the member for Berk-

shire, but, not seeing him in his usual place, regretted he was not in the House, and was passing on to another topic, when his eye discovered Mr. WALTER at the opposition side. He instantly exclaimed—"Oh! I see the Honorable Member. He has gone over at last. While at this side of the House he was

" ' Like the last rose of summer left blooming alone,
All its lovely companions being faded and gone.' "

He then went to work, and effectually demolished the arguments of the neutral members. The shouts of laughter which this ready sally produced, lasted for several minutes. It will be in the recollection of the reader that he applied the same quotation to Mr. VIVIAN.

This Church Bill passed the Commons, and, in the Lords, Sir ROBERT PEEL's proposition was carried out—the first portion of the Bill, regulating the payment of the incomes of the Clergy, was adopted, and the appropriation clauses rejected. That was one item of the obstructive policy. But this was a mere measure of Justice to Ireland. By itself, the rejection of such a measure would not have excited much indignation in England, though, in principle, it affected the Dissenters of England nearly as much as it did the Catholics of Ireland. But the Lords were not disposed to limit, to Irish measures, their obstruction of Whig legislation. The Reform of the English Municipal Corporations was introduced, by the Government, this year, into the Commons. It went rapidly through the Lower House; but, in the Lords, it lingered for months. Counsel were heard, at the bar, against it. Every delay was created, in order to prevent its passing that session, without venturing to excite the popular indignation by throwing it out altogether. At last the Bill passed the Lords, with numerous amendments, which, it was secretly hoped, would induce the Commons

to reject it. The Commons entered on the consideration of the amendments, rejected some, and amended others, and, again, returned it in this altered form to the Lords. Here it underwent further discussion. A conference was held between both Houses, and, at last, to the great mortification of the corporate monopolists, the bill, with most of the Lords' amendments, was accepted by the Lower House, and became law. One of the Lords' amendments took from the Town Councils the power of appointing Borough Justices, and vested it in the Crown. However, Lord JOHN RUSSELL pledged himself, that the Government would appoint those recommended by the Town Councils. His promise was fulfilled, while the Whigs remained in office. They never had an opportunity of applying its principle to Ireland, until their late advent to power, because at the time the Irish Municipal Act, in 1841, came into operation, the Tories held the reins of government. But, in 1847, the present government acted in Ireland, on the pledge given, in 1835, by Lord JOHN RUSSELL to English Town Councils, and appointed to the Magistracy, those recommended by the Irish Corporate bodies. Though the Irish Municipal bill was not the law until 1840, a measure, for the reform of Irish Corporations, was also introduced in the Session of 1835. Mr. O'CONNELL, when the English bill was brought in, said, that the only part of it he objected to was the title. It should have been called, a bill for the Reform of Municipal Corporations, both in England and Ireland. This was a sufficient hint, and a separate title was afterwards introduced, but, in consequence of the delay given to the English measure, the Irish Bill was abandoned. The third measure, overthrown by the Lords, was the Irish Registration Bill—a measure to assimilate the Irish to the English Registration Acts, the appointment of Revising Barristers, as in

England, but vested in the Crown, not in the Judges—to have the duration of elections limited to two days—to have polling places for every two hundred voters—to abolish all oaths but the one of identity, and to regulate the beneficial-interest qualification of the ten pound freeholders, according to the interpretation of such qualification under the Reform Act, and not, as defined by the Judges, that required by the Catholic Relief Act. This admirable measure was rejected by the Lords, because it would, if passed, increase the power and influence of Mr. O'CONNELL—both of which the Duke of WELLINGTON stated were already greater than had been enjoyed by any other man in England, since the Revolution of 1688. Lord MELBOURNE's reply to the taunt of Lord WICKLOW, that he was courting the assistance of O'CONNELL, was admirable. It was indignantly and cuttingly sarcastic. He reminded the late Government how *they* courted alliance with the Chartists. He took up, boldly, the position, that, in a country where the people had so much control, it was natural for the Government to appreciate the political aid of individuals, whose influence with the people was so great as Mr. O'CONNELL's happened to be. It was this discussion, that brought out from Mr. O'CONNELL his celebrated letter to the Duke of WELLINGTON, to which we shall shortly refer.

The course of obstruction, on the part of the Lords, produced very great hostility throughout England against that portion of the Legislature. Mr. O'CONNELL, and his party were chiefly instrumental in carrying through the Commons, in its original integrity, the English Municipal Bill. The majority of the English Members went with Sir ROBERT PEEL for making essential alterations in it, which would have destroyed its efficiency. This disinterested conduct, on O'CONNELL's part, caused a strong feeling in

his favor, throughout England and Scotland, and he, as will be shortly seen, was invited to public entertainments, in several large cities in both countries.

While the Lords were thus employed in impeding the progress of political amelioration, and while the Government, adapting themselves more to the intolerance of their opponents, than to the wants of people, were submitting to the emasculation of their own measures, an inquiry, of no trivial nature, was going on in the House of Commons. It was no other, than one into the system of Orange intrigue, to substitute the Duke of CUMBERLAND, instead of our present gracious Sovereign, as the successor of WILLIAM the Fourth. Through the exertions of Mr. FINN, member for Kilkenny, Mr. SHEIL, and Mr. HUME, the entire Orange-system was developed. Talk of Ribbonism—of United Irishmen—there never was so perfect a system of affiliation as that Orangeism. It extended from the second subject of the realm, the Duke of CUMBERLAND down to the lowest soldier in the army. The Duke was Grand Master; Lord KENYON, Deputy Grand Master; Col. FAIRMAN, Grand Secretary, Colonel VERNER, Grand Treasurer, and Colonel PERCEVAL acted in some other official capacity.

The Duke of CUMBERLAND was in the habit of signing blank warrants—which warrants were certificates that the persons named thereon were Orangemen. These warrants he never signed, without their being first signed by Lord KENYON and Colonel FAIRMAN. The warrants, without his knowledge, and contrary to the regulations made by his brother, the Duke of York, as commander of the forces, were distributed extensively amongst the army. Private soldiers were admitted into the Orange Society, and Colonel VERNER was, it appeared in evidence, in the habit of mixing with such

men. The humbler Orangemen were in the habit of talking of changing the succession, and giving the crown to the Duke of CUMBERLAND. He was often addressed by the title of "your Majesty;" and all Orangemen, from the highest to the lowest, treated him as their sovereign lord and master. The evidence which was given before the Committee of Inquiry, on this subject, is intensely interesting. Impartial justice obliges us to state our conviction, that neither the Duke of CUMBERLAND, nor the higher class of Orangemen were privy to these designs; but, that they were in contemplation, there can be no doubt whatever. There was one matter which created a good deal of suspicion, namely, the refusal of Colonel FAIRMAN to give up a book in his possession, which, he admitted, contained matters connected with the inquiry instituted by the Commons. His excuse was, that it contained copies of private letters, and the story goes, that they were love letters; the knowledge of which would have betrayed some of the noblest fair ones in the Peerage. Others asserted that the secrets of the conspiracy against the Princess VICTORIA were in that book. Be that as it may, when the book was demanded, he disappeared, and was speedily beyond the reach of the Sergeant-at-Arms. The result of this important inquiry was an address to the KING, praying his MAJESTY to prevent the introduction of this secret society into the army, and otherwise to discourage its continuance. This was the means of breaking up, for a time, this vicious organization.

It was in reference to the statement of the Duke of CUMBERLAND, that he had no information to give the Committee, on the subject of the Orange system, that O'CONNELL called him a "mighty great liar"—an expression, for which he was, at the time very much censured. Such phraseology cannot be justified.

During this Session of Parliament, there was a larger number of petitions against the return of members, than on any former occasion. The parties were so equally divided, thus a single additional vote was of consequence—many of the Repeal members were petitioned against. Mr. O'CONNELL, and two of his sons were amongst the number, and the expences this system of annoyance subjected him to, were enormous. His defending his own seat, though he got a commission to hear evidence in Dublin, cost him some twenty thousand pounds, and was the great means of involving him in heavy pecuniary responsibilities.

We have mentioned the attack made on O'CONNELL by the Duke of WELLINGTON. It was not consonant with his disposition, to allow the attack to pass unnoticed. Accordingly, we find him publishing in the London newspapers, immediately after, a letter addressed to his Grace, which, from its style and substance, caused considerable sensation at the time in the political world. There is one portion, explanatory of the causes of his influence over the people, which for the purposes of this Memoir, it is necessary to give.

“ To what,” he asks, “ do I owe all you call power ? I will tell you, my Lord Duke; I owe it all to you, and to men like you. It is you, and men like you, who have created that power—who continue that power—and who, if you be not checked and controlled, will augment, increase, and accumulate that power.

“ It is in the grievances, in the oppressions, in the wrongs of Ireland, that the source of my power is to be found. It is to the sufferings, to the woes, to the miseries of the people of Ireland, that my power is to be traced.

“ You, and men like you, have always governed Ireland with a wrong view and in a sinister spirit. You

have encouraged a party and disparaged the people. You have courted and caressed a faction, a 'pale,' a particular denomination, a sect or a persuasion, and you have insulted and despised the nation. This has been the course and career of British Government, in Ireland for six hundred years ; and here are you and your '*Constitutional blood hounds*,' as your gallant friend, Colonel SIBTHORP calls them, as fresh, as untired, as ready to start upon another crusade of oppression, insult, devastation, and slaughter, as if you were now to begin only for the first time, and that the misgovernment of Ireland had in it all the freshness and incitement of novelty and of untasted gratification.

"These are the causes which naturally account for the predisposing symptoms of my influence. It is the insulting misgovernment—it is the audacious preference of the blood-stained Orange faction to the Catholic population of Ireland—it is the partial administration of justice by partisan magistrates, party sheriffs, prejudiced judges, and bigotted factious jurors—it is the establishment and insolent triumph of a sinecure Church ; it is the exaction of tithes, from an impoverished people, to support clergymen whom they never see, and whose spiritual assistance they are far from requiring—it is the still more insulting insolence towards the clergy who serve the people, and who are calumniated and vilified, under your auspices, by every worthless defamer, from the haughty Bishop of Exeter down to the miserable Knight of Kerry. These, and one thousand other crimes committed towards Ireland, and the myriads of additional evils which they generate, are the originating causes of the popularity and influence which you attribute to me, and which, I believe, I enjoy.

"Allow me to add, that the Irish nation know me to be sincere and honest. They confide in my moral cou-

rage and indefatigable perseverance. They know I never will cease to agitate while one grievance remains unredressed. They are certain that my untiring energies are devoted to the good of my native land. They, of course, are aware of the infirmities of my nature, and the paucity of my ability, but they confide in that gracious God, who, in using so worthless an instrument as myself, and in procuring through such feeble instrumentality, some ameliorations of the evils of Ireland, seems to indicate that a period of mercy, after centuries of affliction, approaches.

“But more than enough of myself, and yet the question remains, how is the influence, or—if you please to call it so—the power I possess to be terminated?”

“This is a question which, if you were a rational Statesman, you could answer at once.—My influence—my power—is to be annihilated by one mode, and by one mode alone.

“BY DOING JUSTICE TO IRELAND—Do what you please, *to this complexion* you must come.

“There is no other method of obviating irregular influence and power—JUSTICE TO IRELAND; FULL, COMPLETE JUSTICE TO IRELAND. This is the remedy—this is the only way to destroy my power. You may try any other method you please, but you will not, you cannot succeed. We fear not your swaggering sword—we care not for your exaggerated report of the number of Orangemen; they are not altogether one hundred thousand, including the over old and the over young, the halt, the blind, the lame. Suppose them, however, one hundred thousand fighting men; there are six million five hundred thousand Catholics; there could be, and, if absolutely necessary, there would be, one million of fighting men in the field—aye, in the field. Men—a million of men, who

would be delighted to get 'leave to fight.' But this is a subject I hate to dwell on; I mention it merely to show how futile and foolish any reliance on the physical force of the Orangemen must be now; more especially, that the conspiracy—the treasonable conspiracy amongst so many of the underlings of that body, to alter the succession, and to supersede the Princess VICTORIA, has, in despite of the concealment of the official menial, exploded; and that the Most Noble Grand Himself has borne his blushing honours and grey whiskers, to the meeting of crowned despots at Kalisch.

“No; there is but one remedy, and that is, to do justice to Ireland.

“Let but *this* remedy be adopted, and there never lived a man more ready to abdicate all power than I am—JUSTICE TO IRELAND—I insist on. Justice from England, and in legislative connexion with England I am now ready to be satisfied with—that is, if it be speedily and effectually conceded. But if you and your colleagues refuse justice to Ireland, then I fall back on 'the Repeal,' and conjure the Irish to insist; and, if unanimous, they will not insist in vain, on the restoration of a domestic legislature.”

It is a singular fact that Mr. O'CONNELL, during this Session, repeatedly voted against Government, notwithstanding the supposed alliance between him and the Ministers. The truth is, there never was any understanding between the parties, and the entire influence of O'CONNELL arose, firstly, from the causes mentioned by him, in his letter to the Duke, which influence was admitted and respected by the Government—and, secondly, because that influence controlled a greater number of representatives, than made up the majority which left the Whigs in power.

As soon as the business of the Session had concluded, O'CONNELL set out on his tour of agitation against the Lords through England and Scotland. His reception at Manchester was most enthusiastic—and his speech, at the dinner, was most effective. He called on the meeting to join him in reforming the House of Lords—the House of Incurables, as he called the hereditary Legislators. He told them that he had been thirty-five years an Agitator, and that he had yet thirty-five years of agitation to spare. Alas ! his sand was running out more rapidly than he expected ; and, within twelve short years, his race of life was destined to be over. He was next entertained at Newcastle-on-Tyne, and agitated against the Lords. He was then heard of at Edinburgh, where a splendid demonstration awaited his arrival. There were fifteen hundred persons at this great entertainment ; and, though a clergyman of Scotland, Mr. BUCHAN, disgraced himself, by calling him, at a meeting of the general assembly, “ an impious man, who disgraced the soil of Scotland,” the great mass of the people hailed him as a great Reformer of abuse, and a friend of human kind, no matter what his creed. His reply afterwards, from Dublin, to this bare-faced slander on him, was worthy of the Christian principles of our great countryman, and showed his calm forbearance, and his high Christian philanthropy. We next find him in Glasgow, where over two thousand ladies and gentlemen assembled, at a soiree, to do him honor, and listen to his soul-stirring eloquence. Then we read of him at Falkirk ; and lastly, on his arrival in Ireland, amongst the Ulster men, in Belfast. Nothing could exceed his popularity at this period. No man, unaided by military despotism, possessed a power so great as O'CONNELL's, in 1835, and we scarcely think any man ever will again.

His letter to the Duke of WELLINGTON explains it in some respect. His undomitable character, and eminent talents, contributed their share to this extraordinary phenomena.

The *Liverpool Albion* thus writes of his tour in Scotland :—

“The progress of Mr. O'CONNELL through Scotland, his speeches, and the immense assemblies of the people who have welcomed him wherever he has turned, have made a deep impression on the public mind in this country. The Tories can speak and write of nothing else.— He is the theme of their unceasing vituperation. They dread his overgrown influence, and yet are impelled by a sort of fascination, to lend him efficient aid in the accomplishment of his objects, by contributing to his personal importance. They seem to forget that, although virulent and constant abuse may put down a man who is only rising into notice, or one who, in consequence of some false step, is in the wane of his popularity, it uniformly tends to augment the power of him who, in the words of JEFFERSON, is ‘sailing with the full tide of successful experiment.’ The Paris journals are full of comments on Mr. O'CONNELL's speeches, and the reception he has met with in Scotland. The Doctrinaires profess to be alarmed at the evident progress of ‘disorganising’ principles; while the Liberals admire the vigour displayed by O'CONNELL, and hold him up to their own party as a discreet politician, who never throws away even a small advantage.”

Towards the end of September, O'CONNELL returned to Dublin. He was received by the Trades of that city, who went on foot to meet him, and a grand procession formed, which accompanied him to his residence in Merrion Square. An address was then presented to him, to which

he replied at great length. The following passage is matter of history and deserves to be given:—

“ We must, my friends, quietly but determinedly join our brethren in England and Scotland, who, I have the happiness to tell you, are ready to join you peaceably but firmly, quietly though energetically, to make the great measure of reform in Parliament complete, by reforming the House of Lords. I want no reform in the crown. That was done by the revolution of 1668, and the prerogative of the Crown can now serve useful purposes, and can injure nobody, for the Ministers are accountable for the acts of the KING. But it is not so with the House of Lords; to procure a reform in which, I will direct my attention, and I know it will be aided by that of the people. It will be impossible to resist us, if we go on peaceably and quietly. We have the KING’s Ministers with us for everything useful. I have been rallying the Whigs of England and the Radicals of Scotland, and endeavouring to effect a consolidation between both, with tolerable success. Having promised a gentleman in the House of Commons, I would do so, he said to me, ‘but the people of Ireland won’t go with you now.’ To which I replied, ‘only wait awhile.’ I told him the people of Ireland would support the KING’s Ministers. Did I not say right? Having then this next step of agitation organised, or in progress of organization, I have only now to remind you, that it is not my fault that the Orangemen have continued to be the enemies of Ireland. I courted them for five years; I sought every means of conciliating them to you; I did them services individually and generally. The Grand Master of an Orange Lodge, Sir A. B. KING, is indebted to me for his present pension—the coal-meters of Dublin are under obligations to me; and, I can confidently say, I made no distinction in my Parliamentary duties between Orangemen and Irishmen.

I courted them for five years, and they have taunted me with having done so. I am glad, however, that I made the experiment; for what would the Orange journals say if I had not done so? Why, that the Orangemen would have joined us had we held out the hand of friendship to them. I now set them at defiance; and after going almost too far to induce them to join the people of Ireland, I may say to them, 'tigers as you are, there is no coaxing you.' What did they do when they found me and the country looking for a Repeal of the Union? Why, the Orange faction rejoiced that they had a country to sell again. They went to the Government and said, that if they would support them, they (the Orangemen) would prevent repeal. All they want is, that Ireland should agitate for a Repeal of the Union; but I think we know our interests better than to gratify them in that particular. Our first step then must be to put down the Orange faction. I will expose them in all their native deformity, liars and traitors as they are. With this view we must be combined—the Reformers of England, Ireland, and Scotland must be united, as I have every reason to suppose they now are. I wish I could express to you the enthusiasm and delight with which I was received throughout England and Scotland. I do assure you I was never better received in Ireland; and, God knows, I thought it impossible to be received anywhere else as I have been received here. Let no man tell you that this is boasting of myself—it is no such thing. I went as a missionary from the people of Ireland, to England and Scotland, where I preached the doctrine of peace and conciliation, and firmness in our struggles for national liberty. I talked to them of the necessity of lessening their burdens, and increasing their franchise. I talked to them in the spirit of charity, and advocated the perfect freedom of conscience to every human being. I told them that the

people of Ireland knew not the distinction of sect or creed—that they were a calumniated and persecuted people—they had suffered ages of misrule, and that the common practice of government, hitherto, had been to allow them to continue in a deplorable state of poverty and distress, even in the land of plenty. I thus expostulated with them, and the mark of respect they paid was not to myself as an individual, but as the advocate of Ireland. It was not the man they applauded—but, as the advocate of Ireland, I was cheered from one end of the land to the other. I pledged myself to that which you, I know, will at once redeem—that they have your most heartfelt gratitude in return. You will show that gratitude by your aiding me in the support of a fostering administration, now that you have got one, by avoiding illegal societies, or doing any thing that could gratify your enemies, or bring disgrace upon your friends, and by joining those friends in the great constitutional struggle, which will eventually make England happy, Scotland prosperous, and Ireland as she ought to be—

‘ Great, glorious, and free,

‘ First flower of the earth, and first gem of the sea.’

O'CONNELL remained but a short time in Dublin. He was anxious for his usual vacation at Darrynane Abbey. During his stay in the Irish capital, he was not, as may be supposed, idle. The Commission, which was sitting on the petition against his return, would, alone, have given him ample occupation. He there, more than once, came into collision with the Commissioners, and, as they refused at first to hear him, he forced them to adjourn their sitting, as he was determined, while they sat, to make them listen to him. He, ultimately, got his own way. The tediousness of this inquiry, and the enormous expense incurred, demonstrated the injustice of an election com-

mittee opening up the registry, and admitting a scrutiny into an existing qualification, which was granted in the registration court. It was to remedy this the Registration Bill, which was rejected by the Lords, was introduced by Government.

During his stay in Dublin he attended several meetings, but none of such importance as to deserve our notice.— He also became reconciled to Lord CLONCURRY, which gave very general joy amongst the Reform party, for Lord CLONCURRY was too honest to be, at such a crisis, kept from co-operation with Ireland's great leader. The circumstance, during O'CONNELL's stay in Dublin, which caused the greatest stir in Orangeland, was the entertainment given him by Lord MULGRAVE. There never was, in Ireland, one more suited, for the office of Viceroy at that critical time, than Lord MULGRAVE. He was a fearless, determined man, and, without shrinking, grappled, at once, with the Orange party. He refused to sanction, for the office of Mayor of Cork, one of the leading members of that society, Mr. DEANE, a most respectable, estimable man in private life, and simply, because he was an Orangeman. The writer was the Chairman of the meeting, which memorialled the Government against the appointment; and he refers to that fact now, in order to illustrate, by it, the strong party feeling then existing in Ireland; for, otherwise, most assuredly, no such memorial would have been adopted against a gentleman very generally esteemed as was Mr. DEANE. Lord MULGRAVE, by that act, gave a death blow to the society. It was also a subject of complaint against his Excellency, that he toured it through the country, and that he, indiscriminately, let prisoners free from the gaols of the different towns through which he passed. We know his proceedings in this respect were not approved of by the Government on the other side, and were afterwards

the subject of much severe comment in the House of Lords. There is no doubt, Lord MULGRAVE was fond of display, and that he indulged his love of popularity to too large an extent. But he most effectually succeeded, by his courteous, unassuming conduct, and his fearless honesty, in securing the affections of the people, and completely tranquillising the country. His great crime was entertaining the great Agitator—of this dreadful transgression, the *London Satirist* of that day, thus writes:—

“FRANKENSTEIN will inevitably drive the Conservatives to utter distraction. He is destroying their reason, at a rate unparalleled in the annals of velocity. They must go mad!—the moon is in *perigeæ*, and they cannot avoid it. What! more honours lavished upon O’CONNELL! Were the ministers not content with his being the real Dictator, the absolute master of the Cabinet? were they not content with placing the entire control of the government in his hands—with making him the virtual ruler of the British empire? No. They must absolutely compel the Viceroy of Ireland to invite him to dinner. They must command Lord PLUNKETT to put him into the commission of the peace, and hear this, ye gods! for

‘ On horror’s head horrors accumulate !’

they actually intend to make him a Privy Councillor!—O’CONNELL a Privy Councillor! Place O’CONNELL on an equality with Derry DAWSON and Admiralty CROKER, with GOULBURN, HERRIES, HARDINGE, WARRENDER, and MURRAY! Oh! we have Popery shining in the ascendant to begin with; but the altar and the throne are doomed—

‘ For nothing can they to damnation add,
Greater than this.’

“ O'CONNELL ! DANIEL O'CONNELL ! the man who denounced the brother of the Sovereign as a ‘ mighty great-liar ;’ the Agitator of Ireland, who called WELLINGTON the ‘ chanco victor of Waterloo,’ or ‘ a stunted corporal,’ according to Conservative interpretation—Right Honourable !

“ The Right Honourable DANIEL O'CONNELL, M.P. !! Good God ! Why, after this, the sooner the Allied Sovereigns, yielding to the solicitations of the Duke of CUMBERLAND and Lord RODEN, consent to establish a grand European Orange Lodge, with the view of setting matters to rights here, the better. Intervention there must be ! England is on the brink of ruin. Was it not enough for O'CONNELL to manifest his enormous influence in the appointment of the Postmaster General of Tetsworth, with a thundering salary of £15 per annum, and all perquisites to boot, but he must insinuate his tremendous hoofs under the Vice-regal board, and not only get himself made a magistrate, but one of the King's Privy Councillors ?

“ Our reader will, doubtless, perceive our inability to suppress the indignation with which we are inspired, but

‘ Who can be wise, amazed, temperate, and furious,
Loyal and neutral, in a moment ? No man.’

“ When we witness these strangely nefarious proceedings, well knowing to what they must eventually lead, we cannot but denounce them in language as strong as may become us as Christians, as journalists, and as men. No wonder that O'CONNELL and the ministers are friends. It is the very inconsistency of the man which renders this flagrant business the more indefensible ! When the ministers caused him to be denounced from the throne, when they heaped upon him every species of contumely and persecution, threatened, derided, abused him—when

they passed coercion bills, ruled Ireland with rods of steel, let the military aid the parsons in the collection of tithes, gave their countenance to Orange insolence and oppression—trampled upon the people to break the spirit of their advocate, suffered every species of intolerance to be practised, and based the Irish government upon injustice and tyranny—then his denunciations poured down upon their heads thick as hail ! They were ‘ cowards,’ ‘ tyrants,’ ‘ oppressors,’—they were ‘ barbarous,’ ‘ brutal,’ ‘ bloody,’ and the rest of it—he would give them no support, no, not a bit of it! like CANNING’S knife-grinder, he’d see them d—d first : but when they ceased to insult and abuse him—when they no longer treated him with scorn and contempt, when, finding that their thunderbolts would never bring him down, that their menaces were wholly ineffectual, that his eloquence and power were above their reach, they showed him some slight degree of attention and respect ; when they manifested a desire to do justice to Ireland, to rule it no longer by force, to strike at the very root of Orange ascendancy—to trample upon oppression, to suffer tithes to be collected no more at the point of the bayonet, to annihilate religious persecution, and to regenerate a’ people, for centuries enthralled in ignorance, and ground down to the earth by tyranny and intolerance ; why then this ‘ brazen renegade,’ with inconsistency unparalleled, turned in favour of the ministers !—applauded the very men whom he had formerly denounced, and now, absolutely, sustains their administration !”

O’CONNELL, soon after the events we have just recorded, left Dublin for Darrynane. He was entertained, on his way through Limerick, at a public dinner, by the patriotic citizens of that place. Leaving him for the present at Darrynane, our attention is called to another

attack made upon him, with a view to damage his personal character, and thus destroy his efficiency.

It will be easily understood, from O'CONNELL'S position in Ireland, that his influence with every constituency was unbounded. Whomsoever he recommended, as a candidate for their favor, that person was sure to be accepted. The smallest county in Ireland is Carlow—and, of course, the constituency was very limited. KAVANAGH and BRUEN were the great Conservative potentates in that county. Having large possessions in it, their influence over the limited constituency was very great. The apprehension, under which the tenantry were placed, in case they politically transgressed, was indescribable, and, therefore, such a county could not be contested without money. In 1835, strong Reform principles were sufficient introduction, backed by O'CONNELL'S recommendation, to any constituency, no matter where the individual resided. Now this should not have been; and, at any risk, O'CONNELL should never have taken up every strange Londoner, who, having money, was willing to expend a little of it for a seat in the Legislature. It is plain, that Mr. Sheriff RAPHAEL, of London, who was elected on the recommendation of Mr. O'CONNELL, had no title to represent Carlow County, and that some Irishman, of known Irish feelings, and national principles, should have been found. O'CONNELL felt this, and accordingly we find him early in January, 1835, writing the following letter to one of the most influential men of Carlow:—

[“Confidential.”]

“Darrynane Abbey, Jan. 4, 1835.

“MY DEAR FITZGERALD—I wish I could get to Carlow. I am most anxious to be in Carlow. Will you see his Lordship, the Bishop, and submit to him my plan? If you cannot get anybody else, I will lodge £500, or, if

necessary, £1,000, for my eldest son, MAURICE, and set him up for the County. MAURICE can, and will be elected for Tralee, but he could afterwards elect to sit for Carlow County, and leave Tralee for a second choice. I say this, only on the understanding that nobody else can be got; in that case, I will make the sacrifice I mention to prevent a Tory getting in for the County. You will, however, recollect, that I do this merely to prevent a Tory from being your member, and for no other purpose; though, to be perfectly candid, I would rather have MATRICE represent a County than a Borough; but, beyond that preference, there is nothing else. I am, however, ready to make a personal sacrifice of from £500 to £1,000 for that purpose. I go to Killarney on Tuesday, the 6th; on Wednesday, the 7th, to Cork. If you have occasion to write to me, direct to me at Cork, care of THOMAS FITZGERALD, Esq., Merchant, Mallow Lane, Cork. Put on it—‘To be forwarded at once.’ Write also to Waterford, by the same post, to the care of the Rev. JOHN SHEEHAN, Parish Priest, Waterford. I will myself write to you again from Cork or Youghal, and tell you the exact day on which I will be in Carlow.

“ Believe me, to be, yours very sincerely,

“ DANIEL O’CONNELL.

“ EDWARD M. FITZGERALD, Esq., Carlow.”

However, it will be seen, by the following to Mr. VIGORS, that RAPHAEL was, ultimately, taken up as the Candidate. We shall see the consequence:—

“ MY DEAR VIGORS—We are all bustle, preparing to fight the Tories in all the Counties and Boroughs. Carlow interests you more immediately. WALLACE and BLAKENEY know they will not answer. The honest men there suggest Mr. PONSONBY, Lord DUNCANNON’S son, and Mr. RAPHAEL, the London Sheriff. Will you call

on Lord DUNCANNON on this business? I wrote to him to say I would ask you to do so; first, to-morrow, you should see Mr. RAPHAEL, and ascertain whether or not he will stand. We could secure him the County at considerable expense—say, for the very utmost, £3,000. You can tell him, that I will be one of the guarantees of his success, if he will thus come forward as the colleague of Mr. PONSONBY. Let me know, without delay, whether there be any chance of effectuating this plan.

“ Believe me always, my dear VIGORS,

“ Yours most faithfully,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.

“ M. A. VIGORS, Esq., M.P.”

As the RAPHAEL affair was one of those incidents in O'CONNELL'S career, which was grasped, with avidity, by his enemies, in order to tarnish his character, we think it necessary, for his complete vindication, to give the documents, and correspondence, connected with it, at some length. And for this purpose, and in order to bring the matter, in one view, before the reader, we shall have to go into the next year, 1836, and group the whole transaction together, though a portion of it, belonging to 1836, may be, in point of time, out of place here.

The first publication of the transaction between RAPHAEL and O'CONNELL, was a letter of the former to the electors of Carlow, the greater portion of which, though long, we must give, in order to put the full facts or statements, at both sides, before the reader, and allow him to judge of the justice of the attack made on O'CONNELL'S integrity and honor. After a few introductory remarks, the letter goes on thus :—

“ Having, for many years, been ambitious of a seat in Parliament, and knowing the influence which Mr. O'CONNELL possesses in Ireland, I addressed to him in th

month of May last, a letter expressive of such my wish. A petition was then pending against the return of Colonel BRUEN and Mr. KAVANAGH, as your Representatives, and, on the 27th of May, the committee declared their election void.

“ On the 28th of May, Mr. O'CONNELL called on me at my town residence, and pressed me to become a candidate for the County of Carlow, assuring me that the only risk I could incur would be £1000. I requested 24 hours time to consider, and on the following day, at the exact hour appointed, I called at Mr. O'CONNELL'S, and was told by the servant he was not at home; in the evening, I received the following note, in consequence of which an appointment was made, for an interview between us, at his house, for the 31st of May:—

‘ 9, Clarges-street, May 29. .

‘ MY DEAR SIR—I remained at home, at some inconvenience, until after the hour I mentioned, I was sorry I did not remain longer as you called shortly after; but as you left no letter or other indication of acceding to my proposal, I take it for granted that you decline my offer—be it so. I only add my belief that you will never again meet so safe a speculation—I am quite sure I never shall hear of one—I have the honour to be, my dear Sir, your very faithful,

‘ DANIEL O'CONNELL. .

‘ ALEXANDER RAPHAEL, Esq.’

“ On the 31st we met, as appointed, and, after some discussion, he wrote, and delivered into my hands this letter:—

‘ 9, Clarges-street, June 1.

‘ MY DEAR SIR—You having acceded to the terms proposed to you for the election of the county of Carlow—viz. you are to pay before nomination £1,000—say

£1,000 and a like sum after being returned, the first to be paid absolutely and entirely for being nominated, the second to be paid only in the event of your having been returned; I hereby undertake to guarantee and save you armless from any and every other expense whatsoever, whether of agents, carriages, counsel, petition against the return, or of any other description; and I make this guarantee in the fullest sense of the honourable engagement, that you shall not possibly be required to pay one shilling more in any event, or upon any contingency whatsoever. I am, my dear Sir, your very faithful,

' DANIEL O'CONNELL.

' A. RAPHAEL, Esq.'

" At this meeting, I gave to Mr. O'CONNELL the address which I had formerly published to the electors of Westminster, which he promised to alter, and I became a candidate for the high honor of representing you in parliament.

"At a subsequent interview, Mr. O'CONNELL wished me to pay the first £1,000 to his credit with WRIGHT and Co., but I told him I preferred it going through the hands of my solicitor, Mr. HAMILTON, with whom I would leave the money. On the 4th, he sent me the following note:—

' 9, Clarges-street, June 4.

' MY DEAR SIR—I have heard from Mr. VIGORS this day, our prospects are quite bright. I will arrange your address for to-morrow's post, and my own for immediate publication. I, at present, entertain no doubt of success; you will hear again from me to-morrow. Who is Mr. HAMILTON with whom you have deposited the £1,000? I do not know any person of that name in London. I hope I shall soon have the pleasure of sitting by your side in the house. Till to-morrow, I have the honor to be your faithful servant and friend.

' DANIEL O'CONNELL.

' A. RAPHAEL, Esq.'

“ On the fifth of June, I received a note from Mr. MORGAN O’CONNELL, apologising, by his father’s direction, for not having written according to his promise, and, on the 8th, I received the following letter:—

‘ London, June 8.

‘ MY DEAR SIR—I sent off yesterday my letter to the electors of Carlow on your behalf; all my accounts confirm my opinion of an easy victory; I doubt whether there will be more than the show of a contest, but I am assured, in any event, of success. I send you a slip of a Carlow newspaper, showing that you are already nominated under the most favourable auspices. I also send you the draft of an address; I beg of you to peruse it, and to return it to me with any corrections you may deem necessary, or if you approve it, then with your signature; my wish is that you should alter it as little as you possibly can. I also send you a sealed letter from Mr. VIGORS. I beg of you to return the address as near to 4 o’clock this day as you can, that I may transmit it to the *Dublin Pilot*, for publication on Wednesday next. All the good men of Carlow see that paper. Let me know who the Mr. HAMILTON is with whom you deposited the £1,000. I expected that you would have lodged it at Mr. WRIGHT’S. It is time this were done. Faithfully yours,

‘ DANIEL O’CONNELL.

‘ ALEXANDER RAPHAEL Esq.’

“ On the 10th of June, Mr. JOHN O’CONNELL called on Mr. HAMILTON, with a note from his father, and received £1,000, for which he gave a memorandum. The following is a copy of the note and memorandum:—

‘ Wednesday, June 10.

“ SIR.—I beg you will hand my son, Mr. JOHN O’CONNELL, the £1,000 placed with you, by Mr. RAPHAEL, for my

use. My son will give you a voucher at foot—I have the honour to be, Sir your obedient servant,

‘ DANIEL O'CONNELL.

‘ To T. HAMILTON, Esq. 2, Henrietta-street.

‘ I acknowledge to have received £1,000 by draught on WRIGHT and Co.

‘ JOHN O'CONNELL.

‘ June 10, 1835.’

‘ And on the same day, previous to the receipt of the money, I having communicated to him, by a friend of mine, that Mr. FEARGUS O'CONNOR called upon me for my decision respecting Carlow, he sent me the following note :—

‘ It is not my fault that Mr. FEARGUS O'CONNOR called on you. Refer him and everybody else to me. I want part of the £1,000 to send over. How shall I communicate with Mr. HAMILTON ?

‘ All well, quite well in Carlow. Faithfully yours,

‘ Wednesday.’ ‘ DANIEL O'CONNELL.’

‘ 9, Clarges-street, half-past three.

‘ MY DEAR SIR—Glorious news ! RAPHAEL and VIGORS returned on Thursday. I do not know the exact majority, but I know the fact. I heartily congratulate you. My communication is from a Cabinet Minister, but this is a private. You can take your seat to-morrow.

‘ Ever yours faithfully,

‘ DANIEL O'CONNELL.’

‘ And on the following morning, the 22d, I received this note—

‘ ALEXANDER RAPHAEL, Esq., M.P., ultimate majority, 56. You are entitled to get your letters free this day.’

‘ On the 13th, I received a letter from Mr. O'CONNELL, with the form of the oath to be made by me, as to my qua-

lification, and with directions before whom it was to be sworn—that letter contained these passages—

‘I am glad to tell you that our prospects of success are, I do believe, quite conclusive; if only one Liberal is to be returned, you are to be the man, I have made all the pecuniary arrangements.’

“On the 17th Mr. O’CONNELL wrote the following :—
‘Wednesday.

‘MY DEAR SIR—I send you VIGOR’s letter to me, just received; you see how secure we are. Return me this letter, as it vouches £800 for me; with that you have nothing to do, as of course, I stand between you and every body.—Faithfully yours,

‘DANIEL O’CONNELL.

‘ALEXANDER RAPHAEL, Esq.’

“The day after, I received the following note:—

‘June 18.

‘I enclose you the ballot of this morning. Nothing can be better.—Ever your’s faithfully,

‘DANIEL O’CONNELL.

‘A. RAPHAEL, Esq.’

‘Mr. TYRELL did not work with the people last election.’

“I must observe, that though I paid the £1,000 in cash, I have been informed that the £800 here mentioned was remitted in a bill at a long date, drawn by Mr. O’CONNELL upon some persons carrying on business as brewers in Dublin; a circumstance that was not very well calculated to induce the electors, or those to whom the money was remitted, to entertain a very high opinion of my pecuniary means. I have also been informed that nothing beyond the £800 has been expended or received in the county. What became of the other £200? or what would have become of the second £1000, in case I had been returned without a contest, or without a petition, it is no business of mine to inquire.

“On the 21st of June, Mr. O'CONNELL communicated to me the gratifying intelligence that I had been returned one of your Representatives by the following letter; and on the 25th, I took my seat in the House of Commons with the full determination to do everything in my power to redress the grievances under which Ireland, and particularly its Catholic inhabitants, had so long suffered; but at the same time equally determined to act as became the *independent* Representative of so large and influential a body of electors as those who had honoured me with their confidence and suffrages.

“On the 3d of July, a petition was presented against the return of Mr. VIGORS and myself; and it is important to bear in mind that it was evident from the allegations contained in it, that his and my right to the seats would be decided on a scrutiny. Hence, the necessity for an immediate and active investigation into all the votes on both sides, and for measures being taken to defend those seats and your rights before a committee of the House of Commons.

“On the 16th or 17th of July, the petitioners perfected the necessary recognizances, and on the latter day, I received the following letter:—

‘9, Clarges-street, July 17.

‘MY DEAR SIR—Send to Mr. BAKER the particulars he wants of your qualification. I will stand between you and him for all expenses. I promised you, and repeat distinctly my promise, that upon payment of the second £1000, to which you are, at all events, engaged, no demand shall be made upon you for an additional six-pence. Do, then, at once pay the other £1000 into Messrs. WRIGHT'S to my credit. Confer with Mr. BAKER as to his defence as much as he chooses. I am bound to indemnify you

for all expenses beyond that £1000—that is, the second sum.—Believe me to be, very faithfully yours,

‘DANIEL O’CONNELL.

‘ALEXANDER RAPHAEL, Esq.’

“On the 25th, I received this note from Mr. O’CONNELL :—

‘9, Clarges-street, July 25.

‘MY DEAR SIR—You did not say to whom I was to apply for the second sum of £1000, according to our arrangement. It is necessary—absolutely necessary—it should be paid this day. Let me know at once who is to give it to me. I have a note from VIGORS, to whom I am pledged, pressing me on this subject. I, of course, am bound to him for the money.—Faithfully yours,

‘DANIEL O’CONNELL.

‘A. RAPHAEL, Esq.’

“On the following day, I informed Mr. O’CONNELL by note, that my solicitor, Mr. HAMILTON, would be in Henrietta-st., and requested him to call on him. This he did not do, but sent his son, Mr. JOHN O’CONNELL, to whom Mr. HAMILTON stated that my understanding of the original engagement between us, in which he fully coincided, was, that the second £1,000 was not to be paid until the seat was safe. This Mr. JOHN O’CONNELL promised to communicate to his father, from whom I received on the night of that day, on my return from the House of Commons, the following letter :—

‘9, Clarges-street, July 27.

‘SIR—I can hardly restrain my feelings, at hearing that you shrink from performing your engagement with me. Rely on it you are mistaken, if you suppose, that I will submit to any deviation from our engagement. I say no more at present, in the hope that there may be some mistake which you will instantly do away—there can be

no mistake on my part.—I am, in the mean time, your obedient servant,

‘ DANIEL O'CONNELL.’

“ My first impression, on reading this very extraordinary epistle, to say the least of it, was to abandon my seat at once ; but on further reflection, and after advising with my friends, I determined to submit for the time to the insult thus offered, and by paying him the second thousand pounds to remove from Mr. O'CONNELL all possible pretext for the non-fulfilment of the engagement on his part. Accordingly, on the next day, I sent him this reply :—

‘ Great Stanhope-street, July 28.

‘ SIR—I deny most positively that I have in any way shrunk from performing my engagement with you. On the other side you will find a copy of a letter you gave me (viz. that of June 1). You must recollect the conversation we had prior to that being written. My understanding at that time was, and ever since has been, that I was to risk only £1,000, and that the other £1,000 was to be paid only in the event of the seat being secured ; you, it seems, put a different construction upon it ; and as I presume we both wish only what is right, I would suggest that the question should be decided by some mutual friend. In the mean time, to prevent all possibility of doubt as to good faith on my part, I have authorised Mr. HAMILTON to pay the £1,000. In conclusion, it pains me to say, that the tone of your letter was quite unwarranted by anything on my part.—I am, Sir, your faithful and obedient servant,

‘ ALEXANDER RAPHAEL.

‘ To DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq.’

“ On the same day, viz., July 28, Mr. JOHN O'CONNELL received the second £1,000, and in an hour after-

wards, the ballot took place and the Committee were nominated.

“ On the 31st, a letter was put into my hand, as I was going into the House of Commons, to be delivered to Mr. VIGORS, who afterwards informed me it was from the agent, and was a very important letter, to which I replied that I had nothing to do with it, and referred him to Mr. O’CONNELL. What the contents or purport of it was, I did not then know, but have since been informed that it contained a statement of the probable expenses that would be occasioned by the scrutiny.

“ On the 2d of August, I met Mr. O’CONNELL by appointment at his house, where he made many violent observations on what he called the partial conduct of the Tory Committee, and stated that he would wait until two votes were disposed of, before he determined what course he would take ; but not one word fell from him on this, or any other occasion ; intimating that the opposition to the petition was proceeding at my expense. I could not, however, from certain expressions used by him, but entertain doubts that it was his intention not to carry on the contest much longer ; and that he would avail himself of the first plausible opportunity of withdrawing from it. In this I was confirmed by the receipt, on the following morning, of a letter from that gentleman, containing something in the shape of an offer, or proposition, so extraordinary and unexpected, that I knew not what to make of it, except, indeed, to prepare for, and reconcile me to, his then intended breach of engagement ; and to induce me to believe it was not only his desire to make some atonement for the consequences of such an act, but that it was in HIS POWER to compensate me, in some other way, for the loss of my seat, which was now reduced to a certainty ; so far, at least, as depended upon him, for his pecuniary or other sup-

port. But as this letter was marked 'strictly confidential,' I am not now disposed to allude further to its contents, but am ready to publish it and my reply, if Mr. O'CONNELL will permit me, to make this narrative complete: suffice it, therefore, at present to say, that I was not to be blinded or duped by this attempt 'to blarney and humbug me;' and only now quote the following extract from that reply:—'I rely, however, on your fulfilling your engagement with me to secure my seat, if possible, by fighting the battle so long as a bad vote for the petitioners remains on the poll, or at all events to the end of the present session. To allow 56 of our votes to be struck off, would leave fearful odds to contend with on a future vacancy.'

"On the 4th of August, Mr. VIGORS, Mr. O'CONNELL, and myself, met by appointment at the Westminster Club, and I was then informed that the Committee had that day struck off the first vote. This, of course, led to some discussion, when I learned, for the first time, to my very great surprise, that Mr. VIGORS had not contributed, and would not contribute one shilling towards the defence of the seats! Mr. O'CONNELL left it beyond doubt that he did not intend any longer to defend the seats, consequently there was no alternative but for me, after having already advanced £2,000 in the confidence reposed in a brother Catholic, either to fight the battle single-handed, or to abandon at once all further opposition, and give the seats, at once, to Colonel BRUEN and Mr. KAVANAGH. Placed in this very embarrassing predicament, I determined at all events, to continue the opposition for a day or two, to give me an opportunity of conferring with my friends. Hitherto I had not been consulted either directly or indirectly, and had not taken any part in getting up the case on the part of the sitting members. Counsel had

been retained, and an agent appointed, of whom I knew nothing, without any communication with me. I was, of course, in entire ignorance of the merits of the case on the part of the petitioners, as well as of the sitting members; but had been assured there were more bad votes on the part of the petitioners than of the sitting members, and that the same evidence as to the value which would disqualify the latter, would, in its turn, apply to the former, and that little doubt existed of the petitioners being defeated. To have abandoned the contest, would not only have given the seats to Colonel BRUEN and Mr. KAVANAGH, but would have enabled them to prosecute the security on their part as long, and in any way they pleased; and, in the absence of opposition, they could not have had any difficulty in striking off nearly the whole of the votes they had objected to, (upwards of 200), which would have given them such a decided majority as would have rendered any opposition, at a future election, unavailing until another registration had taken place. I resolved, therefore, not to allow the County to be left in that predicament without a struggle, and, relying on the assurance that our case was good, I went on with the opposition; but in the mean time, addressed this letter to Mr. O'CONNELL, which he thought it prudent not to reply to, or take any notice of:—

‘ Great Stanhope-street, Aug. 5.

‘ MY DEAR SIR—I cannot express how deeply I feel in being left by you in the painful dilemma of either running away from the fight, with a majority of 56 in our favor or to commence, from to-morrow, an expensive and uncertain contest, without a single sixpence from my colleague. I have, however, by the advice of my friends, determined to continue the contest for a day or two longer, reserving always to myself, if necessary for the vindication of my character towards my constituents of Car-

low, any other mode of proceeding which I may be advised to adopt. I therefore once more call upon you, as an act of justice to me, to fulfil your engagement, as you must be convinced (and you have yesterday declared) that I have acted throughout the transaction in the most honorable manner towards you.—I am, my dear Sir your faithful and obedient servant,

‘ ALEXANDER RAPHAEL.’

“ On the following day I had an interview with Mr. BAKER, the Parliamentary Agent before-mentioned, who had been employed by some one, and I naturally infer by Mr. O'CONNELL, certainly not by me, or with my knowledge, who stated, however, that he had nothing to do with Mr. O'CONNELL, but looked to me, and me only, for the expenses of opposing the petition.

“ The scrutiny continued until the 17th of August, when the petitioners, having struck off 105 votes, and thus converted our majority of 56 into a minority of 49, declared their case for the present closed; reserving to themselves the right of going on with their objections to the remainder of our votes, in case we should strike off a sufficient number of theirs to turn the majority.”

He then goes on to explain the causes of his return being declared void, and how the scrutiny placed BRUEN and KAVANAGH in a majority, and concludes his letter thus:—

“ I am aware that in thus making public what has passed between Mr. O'CONNELL and myself, I shall expose myself to that person's customary and vindictive abuse and calumny; but I feel that the liberal electors of Carlow are nevertheless entitled to its explanation; and if any thing he can do, or leave undone, can, after recent disclosures, surprise his fellow-countrymen, it will be that he has never had the good feeling or decency to express

on any occasion, either by letter or otherwise, one word of regret for what has occurred, or at the untoward termination of what he has pleased to designate as a safe 'speculation,' in which I embarked under a perfect reliance on his honour, patriotism, and integrity, and under the circumstances in part before detailed.

"That I may not do him any injustice, it is but fair that I should, in conclusion, observe that the second sum of £1,000 has been accounted for by his paying in cash £350 to Mr. BAKER towards the law charges, and after repeated applications made for the balance, by giving him a bill for it at a long date, drawn by Mr. O'CONNELL himself, on the self-same brewers as, the £800 before alluded to was drawn on.

"Such, gentlemen, has been the conduct of the individual who, in his letter, recently addressed to the Duke of WELLINGTON, with his usual modesty, thus speaks of himself—'The Irish nation know me to be sincere and honest; they confide in my moral courage and indefatigable perseverance,

"This, gentlemen, may be your opinion; it most certainly is not mine.

"With many and grateful thanks to you for your exertions in my favor, I have the honor to be, gentlemen, your faithful and obedient servant,

"ALEXANDER RAPHAEL.

"Great Stanhope-street, Oct. 30."

To this letter, O'CONNELL replied thus, in an address to the Electors of Carlow:—

"Darrynane Abbey, Nov. 5, 1835.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN—I beg your pardon—I humbly beg your pardon for having recommended to your suffrages that most incomprehensible of all imaginable vagabonds, ALEXANDER RAPHAEL. But the truth is, he deceived me—he altogether deceived me. There is

only one consolation, that he has precluded himself from ever deceiving any person else again.

“ I am bound to acknowledge that I had been cautioned against him—that I had been told he was a faithless creature, who never observed any contract, and with whom no person ever had a dealing without being sorry for it. Why then did I disregard these orations? For two reasons. First—I am in the habit of, perhaps, undervaluing the effect of calumny—and as to calumny itself, I know by the experience of a long life, that the best of actions, and purest of motives, cannot, in many cases, mitigate calumny. I therefore treated more lightly, than it now seems I should have done, those who condemned him. Secondly—He had long solicited my support to obtain a seat in parliament. He canvassed me for assistance, as a Radical, when he avowed himself a candidate for Westminster. After that speculation was given up, he sought my aid at the last general election; and upon my return to London, he assailed me with professions of purity and patriotism, taking up expressions of mine, of my attachment to those who were friendly to Ireland, and in his letters, declaring himself the most ardent friend of our unhappy country.

“ Perhaps I should not have attended to him—I probably was wrong even then in believing him; but this at least is in my favour; that before I recommended him to your notice, I obtained from him a declaration of public principles, signed by him, and of which I was at liberty to make use publicly, if, as your representative, he swerved from any of them in the slightest degree.

“ Such is my excuse for having at any time been deceived by so very worthless a being, as his late mean and malignant, but at the same time, almost unintelligible attack upon me, proves him to be. The disclosure of correspondence written in that absence of caution with which

men write when they do not foresee the possibility of meeting the public eye, places him in a predicament so deplorable, as to be an object of pity rather than of reprobation, or mere contempt.

“ This is my apology for having recommended to you so base a man as he now shows himself—indeed, at present, he is a creature so paltry as to be below reproach. Let me give you just this specimen of this man’s mendacity :— ‘ There is in his publication this passage—mark the hypocritical candour ! !—

‘ That I should not do him an injustice, it is fair that I should, in conclusion, observe, that the second sum of £1000 has been accounted for by his paying, in cash, £350 to Mr. BAKER, towards the law charges, and after repeated applications made for the balance, by giving him a bill for it at a long date, drawn by Mr. O’CONNELL himself, on the self-same brewers as the £800 before alluded to was drawn for.

“ Perhaps there never were so many falsehoods stuffed into so small a space. It may amuse to analyse them.

“ 1st. It is false that the second £1000 was accounted for in the way stated. This is a pure invention—a simple falsehood.

“ 2d. Paying in cash £350 to Mr. BAKER towards law charges. I never paid £350, or one shilling, to Mr. BAKER towards law charges, or for any purpose. This is a complicated falsehood.

“ 3d. ‘ And after repeated applications made to him for the balance.’ Mr. BAKER never made to me any such application—no person even applied to me, or had any occasion to apply to me, for any balance. This is a multitudinous falsehood.

“ 4th. ‘ By giving him a bill at a long date, drawn by Mr. O’CONNELL himself, on the self same brewers.’ &c. I never gave Mr. BAKER a bill for any sum upon any

brewer or brewers, or any bill at any date. This is a similar falsehood with the last.

“ 5th. ‘As the £800 before alluded to was drawn upon. Neither the £800 or any part of it, was paid to any person by a bill drawn on any brewer or brewers. I never in my life drew a bill on any brewer. This makes falsehood the fifth and last,

“ After this specimen, I think it is not going too far to say, in the usual Irish phrase—that you, ALEXANDER RAPHAEL, are a mighty great liar.

“ I have dwelt too long on this subject ; I cannot conclude, however, without stating that RAPHAEL was aware that not one shilling of the £2,000 was, directly or indirectly, for me or for my use ; that I received the money merely as the trustee of Mr. VIGORS, who was the person liable to all expenses, I having been his surety as between him and RAPHAEL. I have to add, that I paid Mr. VIGORS at the time, and as he called for it, the entire £2,000, not only to the last farthing, but that I actually made a mistake, and overpaid him by fifteen pounds ; a mistake which he soon discovered, and, of course, repaid me that sum.

“ As RAPHAEL has had the indescribable meanness to publish letters, which certainly were not intended for publication, it may be necessary to state, for the sake of the public, why the £2,000 were required for him, as the purposes were strictly legal, and beyond reproach ; if Mr. VIGORS agrees with me, as I think he will in the propriety of that course, I will satisfy the public on these points.

“ In the meantime, fellow-countrymen, this incident has taught me just as much of caution, as never again to hold, too lightly, representations by honest and experienced men, against individuals who thrust themselves upon me, and whose character I have myself no personal

means of estimating. The baseness, in the present case, is at once almost equally incredible and unintelligible. If I could understand the man, he might surprise, but could not wound me. After all, I can afford to forgive him this annoyance.

“ I have the honor to be, fellow-countrymen, your ever faithful servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

On this, RAPHAEL addressed, to the Electors, the following reply:—

“ GENTLEMEN—I have read, without surprise, Mr. O'CONNELL'S very *elegant* and *gentlemanly* address to you, purporting to be a reply to mine of the 20th ult. As there seems to be no doubt that the transactions between that individual and myself will become the subject of Parliamentary inquiry, I shall not enter into any further controversy on the subject; particularly as I profess myself utterly incompetent to compete with him in language which I have ever been, and, I trust, ever shall be, incapable of using.

“ I shrink not from investigation before a tribunal where facts, not assertions, however audacious, will prove to whom the epithets ‘vagabond,’ ‘faithless creature,’ and ‘a mighty great liar,’ are most applicable.

“ I will only add, that notwithstanding Mr. O'CONNELL'S ‘guarantee, in the fullest sense of the honourable engagement, that I should not possibly be required to pay one shilling more in any event, or upon any contingency whatsoever,’ I have been called upon to pay and have paid, upwards of £1,100, in addition to the £2,000, towards the expenses of opposing the ‘petition against the return,’ and there are other claims still unsettled.

“ I deny that I have been guilty of any breach of confidence, in publishing the correspondence; no secrecy

was imposed, nor was any necessary, that I am aware of; and had Mr. O'CONNELL performed his engagement, or expressed any regret at not being able to do so, I, of course, should not have published that, which would have been a matter of no importance to any one but ourselves. As it is, he has himself only to thank for this additional exposure of his mode of fulfilling his 'honourable engagements.'

"I remain, gentlemen, your very obliged servant,

"ALEXANDER RAPHAEL.

"Great Stanhope-street, Nov. 13, 1835."

The following letter, from O'CONNELL, put the matter in a still clearer light before the public, and brought the correspondence and the discussion to a close, until the meeting of Parliament, in the month of February following:—

"TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY OF CARLOW.

"Darrynane Abbey, 10th Nov., 1835.

"*Hic niger est, hunc tu Romane caveo.*"

"FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—Whilst I was waiting for that permission from Mr. VIGORS, which I was certain I should receive, to publish the entire of the transactions between Mr. Ex-Sheriff RAPHAEL and us; I amused myself with thinking of the various shapes in which the enemies of civil and religious freedom, who are, blessed be GOD! my enemies, and ever shall be so—will distort RAPHAEL'S composition for the purpose of calumniating me. I know how vain it is, as far as such persons are concerned, to demonstrate that there is not one shadow of foundation for such calumny.

"That is no inconvenience to them. Be it so.

"I consent, by anticipation, to every false statement, and to every fraudulent insinuation, my calumniators may pour out upon me.

“ During the civil wars of 1641, and the subsequent years, when RENUNCINI, the Pope’s Nuncio, contrived, with the aid of a few mistaken men, to obtain a supreme control over the Confederate Catholics at Kilkenny, the army was managed by means of ecclesiastical censures. One day, the entire army was excommunicated, for marching without clerical orders, and, on the next day, they were excommunicated for not marching. Affairs were thrown into utter confusion. The enemy had all the advantage. Nor was there any prospect of success, until General PURCELL got together another army, ready to obey him in all perils, spiritual as well as temporal, and who were, as he expressed it, ‘excommunication proof.’

“ For my part, fellow-countrymen, I have thus become ‘calumny proof.’ I care nothing for calumny; and, beyond one momentary flash of indignation, I feel neither surprise nor anger. All I require is, that the calumny should be false, and capable of being shown to be such to any sincere inquirer into the truth. I should, therefore, pass Ex-Sheriff RAPHAEL, and his commentators, without a reply, but that I owe it to that estimable gentleman, Mr. VIGORS, to give such a detail of the facts, as will, at once, demonstrate to the satisfaction of every just and impartial person, that the lucubrations of RAPHAEL prove nothing, but the mercenary and mean malignity of a disappointed miser, who expended money for the indulgence of the vanity of being in Parliament; a vanity which has chanced to be ungratified.

“ The question is, whether there was any thing illegal, improper, or in any respect unbecoming in that expenditure—that seems to me to be the question which the Ex-sheriff has raised, at least, that is the substantial question. If that question were answered in the affirmative, he would be equally blameable with us—that is just the

fortunate situation in which a libeller of his description places himself.

“ But if the question be answered in the negative, as most assuredly it ought, and, I fearlessly add, will be answered in the negative by every candid man—then **RAPHAEL** should understand that he has the double turpitude upon him—first, of falsely traducing others; and, secondly, of blackening himself, for the bad purpose of gratifying a sordid, an unprovoked, but impotent vindictiveness.

“ Before I enter into the question of whether there was anything illegal, improper, or, in any respect, unbecoming, in the application or expenditure of **RAPHAEL'S** money, let me premise these two facts touching myself, which are really out of all controversy :

“ First—That I had not the slightest pecuniary or personal interest in **RAPHAEL'S** £2,000—not to the extent of one single farthing. I was merely the depositary, and this fact results (even without the aid of any assertion of mine) from the entire letter of the Ex-Sheriff himself. It results, even from the false account he gives (out of his own pure invention) of the manner in which, as he alleges, I paid it over. Every candid man will carry this undoubted fact with him. I had no pecuniary interest in the money, even to the amount of even half a farthing. Let my calumniators chew the cud, upon that act, at their good leisure.

“ Secondly—That I paid over that sum of £2,000 to the person for whose use it was deposited with me—namely, Mr. **VIGORS**—precisely as he called for it, and to his entire satisfaction. I not only paid him the £2,000 to the last farthing, but, having, in my hurry, made a mistake against myself, I actually paid him £15 more than I ought. I got £2,000 for him—I gave him in all

£2,015. He discovered the mistake, and rectified it. I have vouchers for every penny of the money.

“ Every candid man will, also, carry this undoubted fact with him :—That I paid over to the last farthing I received.

“ These two facts will be recollected by every just and impartial man. It is material to the disembarassing my mind of all solicitude on this subject ; that I should repeat them.

“ 1st—I had not the slightest pecuniary, or personal interest in the money.

“ 2nd—I paid over the money to the last farthing, to the person entitled to it.

“ I may be deemed tedious by this repetition—but I prefer being so to having the possibility of evasion, or doubt upon this, to me important, indeed, I think the only important part of the case. I have nothing to vindicate myself from ; and I never will again condescend to say one word upon these two facts which are thus concluded.

“ But I do admit, I readily admit, that having, thus, rescued myself from all possibility of blame, thus far, there remains behind the principal question, touching the propriety of the expenditure of the money. Were we—for I, at once, involve myself in the question, were we warranted in getting £2,000 of RAPHAEL'S money, and expending it in the manner in which it was expended ; and, before all, has RAPHAEL any cause of complaint on that subject ?

“ Now, in order to discuss this question properly, it will be useful to understand these facts relative to the County of Carlow. They are known to you, my friends, but RAPHAEL has made it necessary that they should be placed before the public eye.

“ First—At the general election, in January last, the

County of Carlow was relinquished, I will not say, abandoned, by its former members, and by all popular Candidates. Their resignation was not known until the very day of the election.

“ Second—On that day the people, feeling themselves deserted, started two unexpected Candidates :—The one, Mr. CAHILL, a young gentleman of talent and respectability, and of moderate, though independent property. The other, my eldest son, Mr. MAURICE O'CONNELL, who was not present, and had already been returned for the Borough of Tralee. He was proposed as a popular name.

“ Third—Under all the disadvantages of want of preparation, the popular candidates would have been returned, if there had been time to poll out the County, but the agents of BRUEN and KAVANAGH practiced, so successfully, delay, that these gentlemen were returned.

“ Fourth—The expenses of that contest were borne, principally, by Mr. CAHILL—the residue fell, of course, on the most active partizans of the popular party, who were not well able to bear it.

Fifth—The consequence of the undue election was a petition against the members returned, and the trial of that petition ran to great length, and, of course, created great expense. That expense was borne by Mr. VIGORS, who succeeded in unseating the members, at a pecuniary loss to himself, which can be duly estimated by those only, who have had the fatal experience of an election Committee.

“ Sixth—Mr. VIGORS had just sustained a contested election for the town of Carlow, the entire expense of which, of course, fell upon him, and in that contest he was defeated.

“ Seventh—The County of Carlow has been repre-

sented in the last Parliament by Reformers. It made a difference of four votes to the popular interest in Ireland, to have the two Orange Tories, BRUEN and KAVANAGH, represent that County; and the Reform party in the House of Commons could, at that time, badly afford that numerical loss.

“Under these circumstances, it was that the writ issued immediately on the vacancy being declared. Mr. VIGORS, of course, had exhausted some part of his inclination to spend money to vindicate the popular interest, and could not, in justice to himself, take all the expenses of another contest. Mr. CAHILL refused to stand again. It became necessary to find somebody who would pledge himself to Reform, and to the support of the Ministry, and who would share, with Mr. VIGORS, in the expense. The time passed, there were but a few days to look out for a second Reform candidate. Mr. RAPHAEL had been long urging me to assist him in canvassing for a seat in Parliament. He had been making the warmest professions of patriotic purity. He assailed me in conversation—he besieged me by letter. Indeed it would be amusing to contrast his then disgusting flattery, with his present contemptible malignity. A friend of his had corresponded with me, at the general election, respecting the County of Carlow. Under these circumstances, I talked with him on the subject of the then vacancy for that County. He had an interview with Mr. VIGORS on the same subject, but, as the election approached, Mr. VIGORS was under the necessity of coming off to Ireland, and he gave me full authority to make any arrangement with RAPHAEL I pleased. RAPHAEL’S account of the facts is, in every respect, inaccurate. It is one made up for the senseless purpose of reproach.

“The natural arrangement would have been, that VIGORS and he should have paid, each, half of the expenses

of the election, and of any subsequent petition. But he had experienced already two contested elections—one for Evesham, the other, as I recollect, Pontefract—the complaint was, I know not how truly, that he had been involved in each in an expenditure much beyond what he expected or was promised. I had no notion of peddling with him. My authority from VIGORS was unlimited; my time was over-occupied—I settled with him briefly, but explicitly—that he was to risk but £1,000 in the event of an unsuccessful contest. VIGORS was in that event to pay all the rest—a second £1,000, if he was returned, in no event was he to be bound to pay any more. If he paid one shilling beyond the £2,000, it must be of his own free will and perfect choice. If only one of the popular candidates was to be returned, he was to be the person. VIGORS conceded this, as he acceded to every thing else I agreed to. VIGORS also consented that no matter what the expenses of the election might be, the second £1,000 was to be altogether applied to the expenses of a petition, in case the return should be petitioned against.

“ I settled the matter with RAPHAEL in less time than it has taken me to describe the facts. He called to me for an engagement that Mr. VIGORS would perform his part of the agreement—I complied at once, and wrote him, without a moment's delay, and hastily, the letter of the 1st of June, which he has published, in violation of all the observances of private communication.

“ This was his bargain: he was to pay £2,000;—one-half at once, to defray so much of the legal expenses of the contest; the other half when returned. These sums I stipulated that VIGORS should receive—sums incomparably short of half the expenses. See what an excellent bargain this most discourteous Gentile made. The election for the county, it was known, would last six days,

as in fact it did last ; one day for nomination, and five days polling—and his moiety of the expenses were to be paid for £1,000. I beg of any person who was ever engaged in a contested election for a county, to estimate what the one-half of the expenses of five days polling really amounts to—including expenses of every description. Why, no usurer ever made so good a bargain as this man did. No man ever was subjected to a worse bargain than that which, in his absence, I made for Mr. VIGORS, but which he, at once, adopted and ratified. To show how far we were from desiring that this man should pay more than he ought to do, let me just refer to one expense only, that of printing his address. The *Dublin Evening Post*—an excellent authority on this point—states that the payment made to that print alone, for the publication of RAPHAEL'S address, and mine, on his behalf, to the electors, was more than £30, and that the expenditure for such publication in the other newspapers must have amounted to from 3 to £400. Now, I hate these details. Surely, it is only necessary to say that no man ever yet had a five days' poll for a county, who would not rejoice at having but £1000 to pay as his moiety of all expenses—sheriff, sub-sheriff, booths, poll-clerks, deputies, agents, inspectors, books, paper, printing, advertising, carriage of voters to the assize town, and a tremendous train of et ceteras. I dwell too much on these subjects,

If there should be no petition, I agreed, on the part of Mr. VIGORS, that the greater part of the second £1,000, more than one half of it—whatever might be the amount of the Election expenses, should be applied to commence the formation of a fund, to indemnify the voters, and their friends, and relations, from that persecution which the Carlow landlords then threatened, and have since ex-

exercised. This plan RAPHAEL not only approved of, but declared he would augment that fund, and purchase an estate in Carlow, to enable him to give protection to that class of persons. Strange to say, that, favourable as the arrangement was to him, it was scarcely concluded, when he shuffled and equivocated, and sought to have the benefit of all that was useful to him without performing his part. I concluded the arrangement with him on the 31st of May—yet until the 10th of June, he did not lodge the first £1,000. I had more trouble with him than ever I had with any man. Again, so soon as he was returned, he shuffled and equivocated again, and I was compelled, again, to be very peremptory with him, to make him fulfil the second stipulation.

“The committee was struck—unfortunately it was a Tory Committee. Since I have been in Parliament, I have never known a Tory Committee decline to find reasons for giving the victory to the Tory party.

“My opinion, from the moment the Committee was struck, and especially after their first decision, was, that it was hopeless to contest the matter further. But Mr. VIGORS performed his part of the compact to the letter. Every shilling of the second £1,000 was expended in the defence of the petition. This, indeed, is, in substance, admitted by RAPHAEL himself. He attributes to me the employment of Mr. BAKER. He knows that I did not employ him, and that he was the agent of Mr. VIGORS.

“He attributes to me the payment of the second £1,000 to Mr. BAKER. This is pure invention. He knows that I paid the money to Mr. VIGORS, and that he expended that money, to the last farthing, in defending the petition.

“The meeting of the 4th of August, was held at the instance of Mr. VIGORS. It was held that Mr. VIGORS might, in my presence, announce to RAPHAEL, that so

soon as the last of the £1,000 was expended, he would abandon the contest. We discussed the matter fully.

“ It was finally arranged, by RAPHAEL, that VIGORS, adopting, as he always fully did, my contract, as binding on him, was bound not to relinquish the seats as long as they could possibly be contested—but he soon admitted, that although, VIGORS was bound to pay all the expenses as long as he saw any prospect of a successful issue, he was not bound to continue the contest after expending the £1,000 and, that, when he had no adequate motive to expend more money, he was under no obligation to go further. If RAPHAEL afterwards employed an agent, and counsel of his own, he did so upon the most explicit understanding, that he had no claim upon any person for his voluntarily choosing to do so. Such were the facts of the case. If I were disposed to act as harshly towards this man as he deserves, I could point out in his publication, twenty falsehoods or gross perversions of fact; but I may content myself with recalling, to your recollection, the paragraph I quoted in my first letter, a paragraph of six lines, containing one dozen of what I will call falsehoods. A word of one syllable would be more appropriate.

“ But I cannot conclude, without protesting against the treacherous practice of publishing letters, written in that careless and confidential way, which results from the belief that what one writes can never meet the public eye. It is only in cases of crime, that it is permitted to use such letters, and then only by third persons. But where can this man find an excuse for his depravity, in publishing my note of the 21st of June, telling him of his return, and adding, my communication is from a Cabinet Minister—but this is private. That note—making no part of any charge, accusation, or even insinuation against me, he publishes although it is expressly said in

it—this is private. Is he ever to be admitted into civilised society.

“ But he has no feelings of a gentleman to restrain him; and I notice the publication of that letter, not to bring a blush of shame into his cheek, which would be impossible, but to account for the accident by which I was informed of the return by a Cabinet Minister. The 21st of June was Sunday—of course, no private letters were delivered that day; but I was aware that the returns of the officers of police, from all the Counties in Ireland, in which any disturbance or excitement existed, were received at the Irish office on Sunday. I happened to meet one of the ministry, with whom I was acquainted long before he was in the Cabinet, and continued to have that honour while I was in violent opposition; I asked him if there was a police report that day from Carlow, and whether it mentioned the state of the Election. He said there was, and that it stated that RAPHAEL and VIGORS were returned. I then wrote the private note to RAPHAEL, which he has published, and, thereby, as he intended, excited the calumnious comments of the Tory Press.

“ Men of Carlow—honest and patriotic men of Carlow, I again implore your pardon for having recommended such a man to your favour. He has exhibited a malignant meanness which makes me deeply deplore ever having entertained even a neutral opinion of him. We will forget him for ever. Need I say that his object in calumniating me is obvious, but he will be disappointed.

“ He has exhausted his prospects on the side of liberal opinions, and he wants to qualify himself for the Tory ranks, but he is mistaken. They have faithless and false beings enough of their own, he is not wanting.

“ I conclude, having demonstrated that this man has no cause to complain, that the money he paid was much less than his moiety of the legal and ordinary expenses;

and that, if he had not been the very basest of human beings, he never would have published his letter—a letter intended merely to pander to the bad passions of the Tory party who, however, find it impossible to render it available. His stupid malignity suggested to him that he had an important discovery to make. His story, after all, is but the Idiots tale, and really signifies nothing.

“ I have the honour to be, fellow Countrymen,

“ Your faithful servant,

“ DANIEL O’CONNELL.”

This affair was too fruitful a subject for calumny, for the Conservative Press not to seize on with avidity. The *Times* and *Standard* were conspicuous in their violent diatribes against O’CONNELL. He was charged with a breach of privilege, in having corruptly sold a seat in Parliament for TWO THOUSAND POUNDS ; he was charged with pecuniary corruption, in appropriating the money, paid him by RAPHAEL, to his own purposes ; and he and the Government were both attacked, because after Mr. RAPHAEL’S defeat, he, to raise the Sheriff’s spirits, which were considerably depressed, made him some vague promise of getting him a Baronetcy. But that was not all. His son, Mr. JOHN O’CONNELL, who sat on the Carlow Committee, was charged with a disregard of the oath, taken by members of Election Committees, to judge the case according to its merits ; because, forsooth, he, as the messenger of his father, had received a thousand pounds from Mr. RAPHAEL. This last allegation was set forth in a petition from Carlow, presented on the 11th of February, 1836, by Colonel BRUEN. This charge excited O’CONNELL very much, and, as soon as the petition was read, he immediately rose and addressed the House under great ex-

citement. Some person near him wished to prevent his rising, and advised him to keep his seat.

“ I will not,” he exclaimed, and then proceeded to address the Speaker as follows :—“ Sir, the reason for my interfering between the presentation of these petitions must be obvious to the House. Let me, in the first place, say, that I hope there is not a single man in the House who will not agree with me that there are grounds for inquiry in that petition. It is certainly my opinion that there are. I have undoubtedly always voted for inquiry, when Parliamentary grounds have been stated for it ; and, whether the case be my own, or that of any one else, when grounds are alleged for it, I trust I always will vote for inquiry. For the present, so far as I am concerned myself, I shall not complain of the unusual—I will not call it monstrous—proceeding, that a petition of this kind should be in the hands of any Member without giving a copy of it, or even an intimation of its contents, to the parties against whom it is presented. But, as I have said, for myself I scorn to complain. There is another, however, in whose behalf I appeal to every man of good feeling—I appeal to every father in this House whether it was right to introduce the name of Mr. J. O'CONNELL on this occasion? How could the Hon. Member—is he a father?—consent to lend his authority to an allegation against the integrity, on oath, of Mr. J. O'CONNELL, without giving him intimation that such a charge was to be brought against him? Party spirit, Sir, is bad under any circumstances, but it is infernal when it tears up by the roots every kind and generous and honourable feeling of our nature. And it is through the influence of this party spirit, that I am to be now harrassed by the imputation of—what? Perjury ! against—before God, as pure a creature as ever

breathed—the member for Youghal. Why, Sir, if the hon. member had in his composition anything of humanity—if he were not a person whose desolated villages have marked him out—if the scream of the widow and the cry of the orphan, against his tyranny, were not yet crying in his ears—if he were not of such a nature, he never would have made this attack on the honourable member for Youghal, without giving him that notice which would enable him to throw back into their foul den the calumnies.”

The SPEAKER said—I am sure the hon. and learned member will see, on the least reflection, the propriety of moderating the expressions which he has used.

Mr. O'CONNELL resumed—Perhaps, Sir, I may be excused if, with the provocation I received, I was carried away by my feelings. I must be permitted, however, to say, that when I spoke of casting the calumnies, referred to in the petition, back into their foul den, I meant the expression to apply to the petitioners. It appears, then, that by some I have been understood otherwise. Be it so. And suppose I had used that expression, and applied it as some would infer, let me ask whether I should not be justified in doing so? Is there no Orange den—is there no conspiracy there (pointing to the Opposition)? Well, I *was* carried away by my feelings. Be it so, but I don't think that in appealing on his behalf to the house—in whose behalf alone I do appeal—that any man would condemn me of any great error in being a little more violent, if you please, than I should be on any other subject. But I will go on. I will speak on behalf of the member for Youghal, who has been thus assailed.—I will appeal, in the first place, to this fact—was it not perfectly well known that I addressed the electors of Carlow in favour of RAPHAEL and VIGORS, the men peti-

tioned against? And was not this perfectly well known to the petitioners; and when they chose to leave on the committee Mr. JOHN O'CONNELL, did they not know that I was a strong partisan of RAPHAEL and VIGORS? Have they a right, then, I say, to impeach, for attending the ballot of the committee, him whose duty it was to be present? Had they not a full and perfect knowledge of the part which I had taken in the election?—Why, then, did they suffer the name of JOHN O'CONNELL to remain on the list of the committee? Oh! every body, who understands anything of the committee of this house, understands why they did so. They were secure of their committees. Even though it is I who say it, I call upon—nay, I taunt any man on that committee to deny, if he can, that JOHN O'CONNELL, as conscientiously and fairly, exercised his duty as any other member upon it. Why do I say this? Because the very Chairman of the committee, in answer to something more than an insinuation which I felt it my duty to throw out against their conduct, expressed his regret that I had not followed the example set me by the conduct of Mr. JOHN O'CONNELL. The very Chairman, I repeat, bore testimony upon that occasion to the integrity of his conduct, and referred to it as being worthy of my imitation. But what, after all, is the accusation against him? That he was his father's messenger on the subject of £1000, when it was known that that father was an open partisan of RAPHAEL and VIGORS. So that his name has now been introduced, not to give weight to this charge, but for the purpose of influencing those feelings which are endeavouring to be roused by means of public meetings abroad, and in order to halloo on the cry of the Tory Press, to which, as a stock in trade, I am worth nine-tenths of you at the opposite side. It is for these purposes that the feelings of affection, of love, are to be

grossly outraged. But when I can express a sincere belief that there is not a more dutiful and respectful son than the Member for Youghal—when I am conscious of that—I do not envy the Orange triumph, which amounts to aiming a dagger at my heart, that falls blunted from the shield of the honour, and integrity of my upright, loved, pure, and (except through falsehood) my unimpeachable son.”

Mr. HARDY, member for Bradford, then presented a petition from the Liberal Association of Bath, against Mr. O'CONNELL, for having trafficked, as they stated in seats in Parliament. This again brought up O'CONNELL, who spoke thus :—

“ I can assure the house that all I ever saw or heard of that petition was this—that one of the members for Ipswich showed me a short letter, signed by the President of the Liberal Association of Bath, in which the only sentence relating to this petition was the following :—‘ That you, who have always been an enemy to corruption, ought not to suffer any man to put any money into his own pocket by means of Parliamentary influence.’ That can be only answered in the negative. No man, who is an honest man, could hesitate to do so. But there is a part of the hon. member's address, with respect to which I demand, nay, insist upon a reply from him. What does he mean when he says that the hon. member for Youghal acted under my directions? He has given that as the excuse for the conduct of that gentleman. Now, I want to know from him—and I hope the hon. member for Youghal, will by my strong advice—and all his life, to command has been unnecessary, when I once gave him my advice—leave the hon. member for Bradford and me to deal with this matter. I repeat my question, what is there reprehensible in the conduct of the honourable member for Youghal? I tell the honourable Member for

Bradford, that there is no part of his conduct for which any apology is necessary. He attended this house in the discharge of his duty. He was bound to attend it. He could be committed if he had not done so. Every one knows his connexion with me. There were 11 of those whom the petitioners struck off as unfavourable to them, and they did not strike off the Member for Youghal! Why? These 11 must have been considered more unfavourable than he—or they left him on for parade. In either case, what was there in his conduct that required apology? If no attack can be fairly and justly made against him openly, let it not be covertly insinuated against him. I can tell the hon. member for Bradford that the character of the hon. member for Youghal is stainless as the driven snow, and ever will remain so; and I defy him to state any fact which will convey the slightest imputation of blame on that hon. member. I ask for a committee, and let the charge be there stated; but let not the charge be made under the affectation of an apology, when the hon. member for Youghal has done nothing that requires either apology or explanation. Having said thus much, I will now state what I think to be the fair mode of proceeding. I would suggest that both petitions, be printed, and placed in the hands of every member of the house. This is a question of privilege. I am not wishing unnecessarily to postpone the inquiry; but I wish it to be as full as possible, in order that the absurd notion which every man in this house knows to be false, namely, that a single farthing, or a thousandth part of a farthing, of the money in question remained in my hands, or that I had the slightest pecuniary interest in the transaction, may be entirely done away with. Let there be a fair Committee. I have been battling against packed juries all my life, and I shall not now submit to anything but a fair and impartial tribu-

nal. Let the petitions then be printed ; and let the hon. member for Bradford give notice of a day for taking them into consideration ; on which occasion let myself and the hon. member for Youghal have an opportunity of coming forward and stating everything we have to state in our own defence ; for I shall give no answer to the charge at present. What I propose is, that the petitions be printed, and the day after they are in the hands of members, let the hon. member for Bradford move that they be taken into consideration—and I will support that motion. I see, in the transaction, a distinct Parliamentary ground laid for inquiry. But let me have an opportunity to make whatever statement I think proper in reply to the charge ; and let that statement go forth to the people of England. All I require is, fair play, a clear stage, and no favour. If I am wrong—if I have acted corruptly, I am doubly culpable ; for I am a Radical Reformer. I avow it here—a thorough Radical Reformer ; and I defy any man to show a single act of my life inconsistent with the principles I have ever advocated, or a single act in violation of the principle of purity of election. I do not shrink from inquiry. Give me a generous and honourable tribunal—a tribunal untainted with partizanship ; and here, in the face of the house and the country, I demand inquiry.”

In the course of the discussion Lord STANLEY observed, in reference to the charge, “ that it did hang over Mr. O’CONNELL’s head, and answer it he must in that house and before this country. Whatever application the hon. and learned member was prepared to make of that money which it was alleged he had received, the allegation that he did receive it, and that for such a sum he contracted that a Member should have a seat in that House, fixed him distinctly and substantially with the charge ; whether he meant to apply it personally to his

private advantage, or politically as a means of public corruption, it was equally discreditable to him, as a charge of personal or pecuniary corruption."

Both petitions were ordered to be printed, and the motion for a select committee of inquiry, deferred to Tuesday, the 16th February. The motion came on for discussion on that day, and Mr. O'CONNELL made a long and unanswerable argument. He called for a general inquiry into the transactions connected with all the recent elections, which would develop to the world the proceedings of the Carlton Club. He was delighted at the inquiry into the Carlow case, for it must of necessity lead to this general investigation, and, therefore, produce good. He admitted that his influence in Ireland was too great for any man to possess, but that it arose from the injustice with which that country was treated—that, if its grievances were redressed, his influence would be at an end. He then went into the whole case of Mr. RAPHAEL. He showed that, circumstanced as Carlow County then was, there was no hope of getting a Candidate in Ireland to oppose Messrs. BRUEN and KAVANAGH. The latter was a gentleman of ancient lineage and large landed property—the first was also a man of enormous wealth. They had been both first ejected, on a petition, from their seats, and a new election ordered. On the very day the writ was moved for they retained Mr. AUSTEN as their counsel, in the event of a second petition; thus showing their determination to ruin their opponents with expense. Mr. RAPHAEL was long desirous of getting into Parliament, and, in 1834, spoke to Mr. VIGORS on the subject, and, on the day when the late Members were unseated, he spoke again to Mr. VIGORS, who told him that he should lose no time in approaching Mr. O'CONNELL on the subject, as he was already thinking of another candidate. Mr. RAPHAEL had been a short time

before introduced to Mr. O'CONNELL by Mr. GOLDSMID. He wrote accordingly to Mr. O'CONNELL—Mr. RAPHAEL held a highly respectable position. Though a Catholic he was elected, by the Corporation of London, High Sheriff. He was intimate with many members of the House of Commons—and he was a decided Reformer in his principles, and professed to be a warm friend to Ireland, where, in case of his election, he intended to reside on an estate he would purchase in Carlow. Money then being necessary, for Mr. VIGORS would spend no more,—no one in Ireland being willing to come forward, Mr. O'CONNELL considered himself justified in entertaining Mr. RAPHAEL'S proposal. Mr. VIGORS told RAPHAEL that it would be three thousand. O'CONNELL required two thousand pounds—the last to be paid on his return to Parliament, and to be protected against petition. The whole of the money was paid to Mr. VIGORS and the Carlow Club. Mr. O'CONNELL was, in fact, but Mr. VIGORS' broker, and held the money in trust for him. When the last thousand pounds was exhausted at the contest, and seeing the utter hopelessness of continuing it—first, on account of the political bias of the Committee, and because, of the adverse decisions they had already come to, which made defeat inevitable, Mr. VIGORS retired from further contest. Mr. RAPHAEL however changed his solicitor, and took upon himself to continue, and for this paid eleven hundred pounds more. O'CONNELL, feeling for the depressed spirits he was in, wrote him a letter after he was unseated, stating that he would make interest to get him a Baronetcy. The whole of this came out in the evidence before the Select Committee of Inquiry which was granted. The evidence is too voluminous to be any further referred to here. In consequence of the report of the Committee acquitting Mr. O'CONNELL, Lord JOHN RUSSELL in a speech of great good feeling, moved the following resolutions:—

“ 1.—That it is the opinion of this House that Mr. O'CONNELL addressed a letter, bearing date the 1st of June, 1835, to Mr. RAPHAEL, in which an agreement for Mr. RAPHAEL'S return for the Co. of Carlow, for £2,000 was concluded.

“ 2...That it is the opinion of this house that the whole tone and tenor of this letter were calculated to excite much suspicion and grave animadversion; but they must add that, upon a very careful investigation, it appeared that previous conferences and communications had taken place between Mr. RAPHAEL, Mr. VIGORS, and other persons connected with the county of Carlow, and that Mr. O'CONNELL was acting on this occasion at the expressed desire of Mr. RAPHAEL, and was only the medium between Mr. RAPHAEL and Mr. VIGORS, and the political club at Carlow.

“ 3. That it is the opinion of this house that the money was paid to Mr. O'CONNELL'S general account at his banker's in London. It was, however, advanced, the moment it was called for, to Mr. VIGORS; and, though some of it was paid in bills, the discount was allowed; the amount, therefore, was available whenever wanted, and no charge of a pecuniary character can be attached to Mr. O'CONNELL.

“ That it is the opinion of this house that this money has been expended under the immediate direction of Mr. VIGORS and others connected with the county of Carlow, on what may be called legal expenses, or so unavoidable, that this house sees no reason to question their legality, and that the balance was absorbed in defending the return of Mr. RAPHAEL and Mr. VIGORS before the committee appointed to investigate it on the 28th of July, 1835.”

In the course of Lord JOHN RUSSELL'S speech, he made the following observations, which will show how anxious

he was, as leader of the House of Commons, to sustain O'CONNELL :—

“ What is there, after all, in this proposal which has been made the subject of so much discussion, to get Mr. RAPHAEL made a baronet? What is there, but that Mr. O'CONNELL suspected Mr. RAPHAEL had suffered very much from the transaction, and that his vanity would be gratified by an offer of a baronetcy? I think it was exceedingly improper in Mr. O'CONNELL to write any such offer, or make any such offer, but to found on this circumstance a charge of criminality is the very utmost height of extravagance. Nobody has ever proved, nobody has attempted to prove that Mr. O'CONNELL ever, in conjunction with this transaction, asked any member of the Government to make that compensation to Mr. RAPHAEL, still less has any honorable member attempted to prove that any member of the Government ever listened to such a proposition; and not finding Mr. RAPHAEL to be any other than he was, what a failure this is, on the part of Mr. O'CONNELL? He is a man who, it is said, every day, every morning, every noon, every night, in both Houses of Parliament, is the man who directs the whole Government—the man who can do every thing he wishes—the man who reigns paramount in Ireland—, under whose supremacy the Lord Lieutenant does nothing but obey his dictates and fulfil his directions—and yet, after all, this all-powerful man is totally unable to prevail on any member of the Government to make the Sheriff of London a Baronet. All the charges are trumpery; but this, after all, is the most trumpery, the most frivolous, the most contemptible of the whole. I will conclude by stating my opinion of the whole transaction, and the manner in which it has been brought forward. I do not believe that my honourable and gallant friend, whose speech has been referred to to-night (Sir R. Fer-

guson) meant any such thing, as that the party I see opposite were engaged in any plot or conspiracy to ruin Mr. O'CONNELL on a false accusation; but this I do say, and I do believe—that the minds of many have been warped and perverted on this subject, by the grossest misrepresentations, got up by dirty and base creatures who, seeing the cause of Liberal Government going onward in England, and the cause of religious liberty flourishing in all parts of the United Kingdom, have thought that, if they could not withstand the mighty and irresistible arguments by which the great and holy cause is supported—that if they could not overthrow the reasons and arguments in which the best and brightest men who have lived during the last century in England have concurred, they might at least be able to fix upon an individual of great influence in Ireland, to endeavour to fasten upon him the stain of criminality; and, through him, to injure and subvert the cause with which he is intimately connected. I have said already, that I did entertain some fears that if the question had been brought forward at an earlier period, a great portion of the Tory, or as the Noble Lord has said, 'to use a milder term—Conservative' party might have been induced to take a part in these false, unfounded, and gross accusations. But I am glad to see that, by the course this house has pursued in appointing a Committee of men who were to act in their individual capacity, that great party is saved from this great disgrace; on the contrary, they have proved on the Committee that whatever their objections to the individual—whatever their dislike of his political conduct, whatever their dread of his political influence, they were ready to do him the fullest and most impartial justice, when he was brought before them as a judicial tribunal. I ask the House of Commons to ratify the honour of those Members and of that party, and to agree

with me in sanctioning the proceedings of that Committee. And sure am I that we shall all have reason to rejoice, if, upon a subject so peculiarly calculated to excite party animosities, we are able to say, that an accusation having been brought forward against a popular leader, which a large party in the House of Commons might have made their own, they shrunk from that which they thought was an injustice—and all concurred with those who were the most opposed to them in politics, in saying that whatever might be their political differences to an individual, injustice should not be done by the British House of Commons.”

Lord STANLEY admitted that O'CONNELL was quite freed from all charges of corruption in the transaction. The resolutions were carried, and thus terminated the other abortive attempt to tarnish the reputation of our illustrious countryman. The truth of the matter is, O'CONNELL wanted at all hazards to keep out the Tories, KAVANAGH and BRUEN, and he was ready to aid any one whose principles he approved of, and who had means to meet the contest. The only circumstance in the whole of this transaction which, in our opinion, required any explanation, was the fact of his having lodged the money in his general account at Wright's Bank, and disbursed it by bills drawn on other parties. This mode of payment, however, was accepted by VIGORS, when O'CONNELL told him it would be an accommodation. At the same time, O'CONNELL said he could have the money if he pleased. Therefore, though it would have been better not to have allowed another's money to be mixed up with his own private transactions, it is perfectly plain that the mode of payment was not only perfectly acceptable to Mr. VIGORS, but, as he himself stated, he had no difficulty whatever in getting cash for the bills.

During the discussion of this transaction in the public journals, a new antagonist entered the lists against O'CONNELL, in the hope of succeeding in what Lord ALVANLEY failed—that is, in ejecting the Great Irish Agitator from BROOKES's Club. This new antagonist was no other than Sir FRANCIS BURDETT—this gentleman who had been once “England's Pride and Westminster's Glory”—the great Radical Reformer of the day, soon after the passing of the Reform bill gradually exhibited symptoms of tergiversation, and at last became a decided supporter of the Conservative party. It is impossible to describe the contempt with which he was treated by the Liberal Press, and by his own constituents. One of his first demonstrations in this course of policy, was his attack on O'CONNELL. He was considered the main-stay of the Government. Their majority in Parliament was made up of his friends, relatives, and adherents. Every act against him was a dexterous stroke of party policy. In that view, by the public and by his Constituents, was the letter of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT considered, which he addressed to the members of BROOKES's Club.

The object of this letter was again to call on the Club to expel O'CONNELL, because of the language he used in his published correspondence towards Mr. RAPHAEL, who was also a Member of the Club ; particularly for having called him a LIAR—“the usual Irish phrase.” Sir FRANCIS BURDETT concludes his letter thus :—

“What Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL is pleased to style the ‘usual Irish phrase,’ I scarcely ever heard ; and I cannot help thinking that any man in Ireland in whose mouth it was familiar, would be very short-lived, at least were he willing to abide the usual consequence of indulging in it. In that case Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL himself would not be so old as he is by a fortnight. He has

placed himself in a state of impunity, exalted or degraded, as men may happen to regard it. At all events, however, he stands in the predicament of being the last man in the world who ought to allow himself the use of such language, which, on the contrary, with the least feeling of self respect, he ought particularly to avoid. I would, moreover, ask you, gentlemen, your opinion of his speech respecting the Duke of Wellington. Was there ever anything equal to its presumption and insolence, except its injustice? I doubt if there is a tap-room in the country, out of which he would not have been turned for it. It is an insult to the nation, a sort of general offence. We may, however, rest satisfied that it has been most amply rebuked—rebuked most severely, though unintentionally and unthought of—by the properest individual in the country, in his eloquent address to a public meeting at Bath—by Colonel NAPIER, a somewhat more competent judge, and more capable of estimating the great qualities of the Duke of WELLINGTON, than Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL. This gallant officer, in drawing the great man's character, drew unconsciously his own—generous in mind, capacious in understanding, and, above all, just; the gentleman, soldier, scholar, patriot, stand forth conspicuous, drawn by the hand of a master, unconscious of what he was about. Look on this picture and on this—drawn equally in the same way, and with the same unconsciousness, both strikingly alike, neither requiring a name to be written under it. On looking back, during no very long period, towards Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL's proceedings, whether writing a whimpering letter to a calumniated friend, or a blustering one to *the base and bloody Whigs*, or reviling the *Sassenagh* (meaning the English—*Hibernice, the enemy*), or, when endeavouring to

impose upon them, extolling them for their candour, generosity, and love of justice—whether bullying with a deluded crowd at his heels, or falling on his knees before a Roman Catholic Priest (thus playing at once idol and idolator), I cannot think but that it is absolutely necessary to the character of our club, to exonerate itself from the burden of such a member.

“ I am Gentlemen, your most obedient,

“ FRANCIS BURDETT.”

This letter caused much gossip at the time, but nothing came of it. The electors of Westminster met and severely took him to task, and protested that he was unfit to retain the representation after such a production. Sir FRANCIS replied in a letter which sufficiently indicated the dotage to which he was fast approaching. It was scurrilous and incoherent ; most certainly not worthy of Westminster's representative.

O'CONNELL was very popular with the Constituency of Westminster. It was even contemplated to elect him as their representative. But he speedily put an end to such a movement, by declaring his intention of not deserting the Dublin electors in the struggle in the petition against him, and so long as he was elected, to continue their representative, as appears by the following letter :—

“ London, 10th March. 1835.

“ MY DEAR RAY—The report about Westminster is absurd—it is one of those things which the newspapers take up without authority, and thus create alarm without a cause. I would not abandon my Dublin constituency, without at least consulting their wishes.

(Signed)

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

The first notice taken of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, by O'CONNELL, was in the following letter to the people of Ireland :—

“ Darrynane Abbey, 27th Nov., 1835.

“ *An ounce of civet—good apothecary !*”

“ BELOVED FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—You perceive how I am assailed ! There never yet was any mode of attack which has not been practised upon me. I receive all as the wages of my devotion to every principle of civil and religious liberty—but, above all, of the unabated enthusiasm with which I cherish the rights and abhor the wrongs of our loved and abused land—

‘ For it is treason to love her, and death to defend !’

“No matter, I can bear ten times as much—and as the greatest suffering I can bear—I can cheerfully bear the puline and sickly affectation of those who foster the most atrocious of my slanderers ; and yet are ready to faint with gentility, and die of ‘ aromatic pain,’ because in a strife, not of words but of things, I do call things by their right but ugly names.

Of this, more another day. For the present, I write merely to assure you that I will feel it my duty to appeal by letter, and also personally, to the constituents of ‘ what was’ Sir Francis Burdett, on the subject of the unprovoked and preposterous attack made upon me in the *Times*, in the name of that Baronet. I will make that appeal in about a fortnight, unless I shall have ascertained in the interval that the unhappy gentleman has been placed by his friends under personal restraint. It is, indeed, manifest that he is likely to do himself—poor man—a mischief, unless he be well looked after. If he, however, continuo at large, it will be my melancholy duty, to call the attention of the electors of Westminster to his conduct, and to that of his proteges—of those whom he has sagaciously grouped under his fantastic protection.

“In the meantime, I will look out for ‘a commodity of good words.’ Everything that falls from my pen shall be redolent of the civet. I will carry on the political warfare with ‘*Eau de Rose*.’ He who tells base lies shall in future be merely a ‘falsificator;’ he who betrays his principles, his party, and his country, shall be a ‘foolish and fading gentleman;’ and he who, with only one virtue and a thousand faults, abandons that virtue, but corrects none of his faults, shall be—I do not at present know exactly what—but I will discover some perfumed word, so soft as not to shake the shattered nerves of the most unsound, personally as well as morally, of the antiquated *roues* of St. James’s.

“For myself, these assaults serve only to rouse me to renewed, to redoubled efforts. There is much to be done to carry into practical effect the principles which the BURDETT of a former day *professed*. More remains to be done to give Ireland a chance of permanent good Government. The present ministry, virulently assailed by powerful enemies and insidiously, and therefore most basely, betrayed by pretended friends, throw one moment of blessed light and salutary heat upon the gloom of our unfortunate country; but it may be, like the lightning’s glare, transitory, and only making the returning darkness more hideous. Let us, then, detect and despise those who aid the common enemy at such an awful moment.

“You know, fellow-countrymen, that I am, and will be ‘while there is life in this heart,’

“Your ever-zealous, devoted, and faithful servant,

“DANIEL O’CONNELL.”

On the twenty-second of December following, he addressed a letter, occupying over three columns of the *Morning Chronicle*, to the Electors of Westminster, in which

he exposes the tergiversation; and inconsistencies of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT. He demonstrates that, in the use of coarse language, he, too, was an adept; and he vindicates himself from the charges made by the Baronet. It is quite true that, in the position O'CONNELL, held at the head of an oppressed people, looking for liberty—attacked as he ever was, by the jealous, the vindictive, the personal enemy, and the public foe, it was scarcely possible for him, under the excitement of public speaking, to avoid giving expression to his feelings, in language which the impartial writer cannot justify. There was “calculation” too, in the use of this language; his sledge-hammer sarcasms made him feared by his enemies, as his integrity and his generous disposition, made him beloved by his friends. But there are expressions recorded, as used by him, that no party feeling could justify. The Duke of WELLINGTON was, for instance, called by him a “stunted corporal.” Posterity will pronounce a verdict against him for that expression, for though the Duke is a bad politician, it is impossible to deprive him of the fame of great genius, as a military chief. The Duke of CUMBERLAND was called by him a “mighty great liar,” because of his statement, that he was not aware orange warrants, with his sign manual, were given to the army. O'CONNELL, from the evidence before the select committee, held the opinion that he must have known it.—This is, in our opinion, problematical, and, under any circumstances, the application of such epithets, to the conduct of one who could not resent it, could not be justified. It is true that party spirit ran very high in those days, and that it was a system of abuse at both sides—it is true, also, that O'CONNELL, elevated as a target of attack, had much to endure, and if he was not prepared with strong language to encounter his assail-

ants, they would have increased ten-fold—they would have taken advantage of his mildness to wound him, because of his politics. That was not O'CONNELL's disposition—he never would submit to attack, or even to opposition in public. In private, he was very yielding—too yielding, and often gave up his own views for the purpose of avoiding public exhibitions of disunion. But, before the world, he was inexorable, and hence it is, that he was so unsparing in the language he often used. It was as often the result of policy as it was of impulse. But undoubtedly there were cases, during his great career, when the policy was injudicious, and the impulse inexcusable.

In virulence and religious antipathy, nothing could exceed the conduct of the Tory party in 1835. Even the mild, amiable, unobtrusive Dr. MURRAY, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, was blackballed by the Irish Society. Nothing could justify such outrageous conduct in a body, supported by the public funds, and devoted to scientific and such congenial pursuits. The consequence of this act was the withdrawal of the grant, until the Society complied with the wishes of Government, and altered its rules with respect to secret voting. Dr. MURRAY was one of those distinguished men, that have, from time to time adorned the Irish Catholic Hierarchy. He was no politician—he kept himself aloof from political turmoil and contention. He was the last man in Ireland who ought to have been rejected by a Society like this, unless the wish was to exhibit, on every occasion, hatred for the religion he professed. It was the same spirit as that, which in England sustained the *Times*, in its unmitigated insults on the whole body of the Catholic Clergy, that cheered on the writers of that Journal, when they called the Irish Priesthood—'a disgrace to

the name of Christian ministers'—'absolute, selfish, coarse, and hateful tyrants'—'vulgar minded, shallow, and unprincipled quacks'—'spiritual tyrants'—'brutal autocrats'—'surpliced ruffians'—'wretched impostors'—'Popish ruffians'—'pious terrorists'—'atrocious hypocrites'—'a brutal priesthood'—when they called Archbishop M'HALE a 'wolfish fiend,' and Dr. MURRAY 'a disgusting demagogue.' Such was the state of feeling, in Orangeland, in 1835. To put this down, and, at the same time, to resist the efforts of the Anti-Irish to conquer at the registries, was O'CONNELL's object, and, in this, he was joined by the Reformers of Ireland, and a Registration Association was established.

O'CONNELL, this year, endeavoured, as we have seen, in his tour through England, to raise an agitation against the House of Lords. On his return to Ireland, he addressed, to the Editor of the *Leeds Times*, two long letters, dated from Darrynane Abbey, on the subject. His plan was feasible enough. He would have the House of Lords an elected body, to consist of one hundred and fifty members—to be chosen by the people from the body of the Peers—of which the number should not be less than five hundred. He adduced strong arguments in favour of his plan of Reform. It was popular for the time, owing to the conduct then pursued by the House of Lords; but it soon faded from the recollection of the public, and, until their Lordships again array themselves in hostility to the people, there is no probability of its being revived. The truth is, the English are attached to their Aristocratic Institutions. They are proud of their Aristocracy, and, unless their feelings be excited by a useless obstruction to legitimate Reform, they will never indulge a desire to alter the constitution of the Upper House.

A very singular application was made to Mr. O'CON-

NELL this year. It came from some prisoners, under trial for treason, before the Chamber of Peers of France—namely, the Lyons Conspirators. The application was made to him through one of themselves, an Englishman, Dr. ARTHUR BEAUMONT, then confined at St. Palagie, near Paris. It was that O'CONNELL should go over to France to defend them. Such an instance of confidence, in the genius and judgment of the man, was never before exhibited. To select him to urge on the Chamber of Peers of a foreign country, the right of his clients, under the Charter, to trial by Jury, and then, before that Jury, to defend them, proves the exalted reputation he enjoyed on the Continent. Indeed, his recent progress through France, on his way to Rome, sufficiently demonstrated the veneration in which he was held. His reply to this application is an historical record of much value, and deserves a place in this Memoir. He says, writing to Dr. BEAUMONT, from Darrynane, on the 8th December, 1835 :—

“SIR—I beg leave, through you, to reply to the address signed by you and several other prisoners confined in the prison of St. Pelagie, in Paris, which, although written on the 8th of November, has but recently reached my hands.

“You request (in terms too flattering to be repeated by me) that I should undertake, as counsel, your defence before the Chamber of Peers, at least so far as relates to the preliminary question of the competence of that extraordinary and very unsatisfactory tribunal. I am truly proud of being deemed worthy of such a request; and would consider it a great honour to undertake the task of your defence, but I am restrained from attempting it by one only motive—the conviction of sheer incapacity to perform that duty efficiently in the French language. It is true that I understand the language well; but I can-

not speak it with that abundant fluency which so important an argument would require. I never write out any discourse before hand, nor could I do it, without utterly cramping the force and nerve of the very limited talent I possess; and my command of the French language is not sufficient to enable me to translate my ideas as I went along in speaking, without embarrassing my powers of thought, and diverting them, into the search for words, from the attention necessary to reason the points with effect.

“ I am thus minute in the detail of the cause which prevents my accepting, as I otherwise would with pleasure and pride, the office of your advocate, and that of your fellow-prisoners; and I am thus minute, that it may be distinctly understood, that, if I felt myself competent to that office, I should deem it a duty as well as an honour to accept it.

“ If I were competent in point of language, I should be exceedingly glad to undertake your defence; because I have the most profound conviction, as a lawyer of many, very many years experience, of the utter incompetence of the Chamber of Peers to try you; an incompetence which can be removed only by an outrageous violation of constitutional law, of individual right, and of universal justice.

“ By the charter, won with the blood of the French people—trial by jury was, in all its integrity, consecrated as their surest protection and most precious right; by that charter the authority of the Chamber of Peers over treasonable offences was reserved for jurisdiction and definition to a future law—a law which was not enacted until long after the period of your arrest, nor indeed, until the passing of that concentration of tyranny and injustice—the FIESCHI Code. But it cannot be contended for, without abandonment of all right reason, and

a subversion of every principle of justice, that the FIESCHI Code can have a retrospective effect, and involve in its toils imputed offences said to have been committed years before that code existed. An *ex-post facto* effect of that description would be the consummation of all injustice.

“ Deprived of giving you my personal assistance, allow me to proffer my advice. Should the Chamber of Peers over-rule your plea to its jurisdiction, it seems to me that you should not take any other part in the trial; leave them to work out their iniquity of themselves; that Chamber is, at best, only a new edition of our ancient but abolished Star Chamber—a species of tribunal which the English were too wise and too good to tolerate, but which, I am sorry to say, Frenchmen have not the love of liberty, or the moral energy, or the moral worth to abolish.

“ The first fact in the judicial history of that Chamber was the murder of the gallant NEY—murdered in violation of the faith of treaties: a murder which covered with infamy, not only its perpetrators, but all those who having the power to prevent, yet permitted it to take place. I see nothing in the recent history of that Chamber to induce me to think that it has mitigated the propensity to cruelty, and to the violation of good faith which it exhibited in the slaughter of the lamented NEY. But whilst I express my sympathy for your sufferings, and my regret that I am unable to afford my untalented, but honest and zealous services in your defence, let me not be misunderstood, as I should be, if I were conceived to concur in your political views as republicans. I acknowledge that France has no sufficient guarantees for her liberties—nay, scarcely any at all. I do admit that Frenchmen are political slaves; and that, with the exception of a few forms, the French are as completely devoid

of political freedom as were recently the Algerines, before they were conquered by France.

“ You have no adequate representation—no sufficient check to the avarice of your deputies, no reasonable protection for your personal safety, and your properties are at the mercy of a majority of your Legislature, which majority is actually in the pay of your hard-hearted ruler. Your Press is bound in fetters of steel, and Frenchmen are insulted by that atrocious libel law, which directly and in terms violates the charter, and tells you that you are too worthless to be allowed to listen to the truth. It is quite true that the French are the slaves of him who ought to be their servant—but still I am convinced that a Republic is not the remedy. The territory of France must be distributed into federal States, before it could form a peaceable and parental Republic. Liberty now requires the localization of power, not its centralization, besides, allow me to say, that there is not in France enough of political knowledge, or enough of political morals, or enough, above all, of religion for a Republic. Believe me, that the sole, safe basis of a great Republic, can be found only in the deepest sense of accountability for an eternity of weal or of woe, which religion alone can inculcate and preserve.

“ Pardon, if these expressions are considered offensive. You have addressed in the style of ‘Citizenship,’ which, although not only innocent, but friendly, as used by you, yet was once in France employed by the worst and most sanguinary of men. I am aware how entirely you and your party differ, both in theory and in practice, from such men; nor am I misled or affected by the outrageous calumnies published against you—but, on my part, as I enter into no compromise with the faults or the crimes of monarchs or rulers, so I never flatter the views, or encourage the mistakes of the people. You, Sir, will

perceive that I have mixed you with the other persons who are Frenchmen ; you have a different case, however, which belongs to yourself alone amongst the accused ; namely, your rights as a British subject—rights which, in my sober and solemn judgment, will be grossly and illegally violated, if the Chamber of Peers presume to try you. In that case, it will be for the British Ambassador to interfere, and to insist on affording you protection.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir, your very obedient humble Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

We cannot close the history of O'CONNELL'S career, during this remarkable year, 1835, without stating that, on the subject of providing, by compulsory taxation, for the destitute, his views had undergone alteration. He maintained, still, that no one had a right to demand sustenance out of the means of another, but in consequence of the tyranny, now being exercised by the Landlords against their tenantry, and the miseries which were the consequence, he was determined to counteract their misdeeds by a Poor Law. His conversion, such as it was, was hailed with delight by POULETT SCROPE, and gave general satisfaction. He stated, at a meeting in Limerick, that he was preparing a plan which would meet every purpose, without risking that destruction of property, which he apprehended from a sweeping Poor Law. He appeared to have been much struck with the English amended Poor Law, but we don't imagine his plan embodied the work-house system—a system which he, afterwards, strenuously opposed on the introduction of their Poor Law, by the Government, into Parliament.

The annuity was, this year, larger than it was the preceding one. The people saw the enormous expenses their confidence had entailed on him—they felt that he

should be enabled to meet them. The Dublin election, and the subsequent defence of his seat was, alone, an enormous expense. Several of his immediate family had seats in Parliament. All this demanded a lavish expenditure of money, which no private fortune could meet, and generously and freely did the nation step in for his protection. The following Address, previous to the collection of the annuity in Cork, in 1835, from the pen of the writer of this Memoir, exhibits more vividly, than at this distance of time he could now pourtray them, the sentiments of the popular party towards their great Leader. It ran thus:—

“ FELLOW-CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN!—Patriotism and an enduring love of justice are amongst the brightest ornaments in the Irish character. In you, these characteristics have ever been prominent; and Ireland, relying on the operation of those active virtues, again appeals to you to assist, for your own sake, and for your Country, in upholding in his high and influential position, the judicious Trustee of her interests—the untiring advocate of her rights—the eloquent and fearless denouncer of her wrongs—**DANIEL O’CONNELL**. Elevated as he now is, by his talents, his integrity, and his Country’s confidence, to the high, the enviable, but responsible station of a People’s Representative—looked upon by Europe as a nation’s hope, he is now more necessary for the interests, and in a better position than ever to improve the condition of Ireland. By his influence, shades of political opinion will continue merged in the unanimous determination of supporting a Government pledged to promote the peace and happiness of the Country, and to prune away those blighting grievances that, like a cancer, prey upon the very vitalities of Ireland. By his opposition, in a great measure, will the Orange faction remain shut out from place—despised, defeated, and

powerless. By his eloquence have the sympathies of England and Scotland been already excited in favour of his Country; and his perseverance and influence with the people, will ultimately prevail against a selfish and aristocratic party, who are opposed to the interests of Ireland—who have rejected all the measures intended for her tranquillity and amelioration, and who have, for another year, imposed tithe exactions and Corporate abominations upon the Country. This opposition must succumb to the power of the popular opinion, generated, as it has been, and kept alive, as it will be, by the influence and masterly eloquence of O'CONNELL. But, fellow-citizens and countrymen, at the same time that you, the People, have placed O'CONNELL in that lofty position which enables him to effect so much for Ireland, bear this in mind,—you have also forced him to relinquish the vast emoluments of his profession—you have shut him out as a lawyer from the attainment of offices worthy of the ambition of any man, and which, in addition to honour and distinguished rank, bring with them an increase of professional income—you have deprived him not only of that prospective, but also of his usual professional income—you have demanded, from him, the individual and untiring energies of his mind—you have placed him in a sphere that calls for an expenditure which no ordinary private fortune can maintain; and you have entailed upon him expenses of a political nature unconnected with those of a personal and domestic kind. How enormous must have been the expense of the Dublin Petition—how prodigious the outlay caused by the Youghal, the Meath, and the Tralee Election and Petitions! Think you that ten thousand pounds is an exaggerated calculation; and think you, that if vast political power is wielded by him, not with private views, or for personal aggrandizement, but by the Country's desire, and for the country's good

—think you it is justice to allow the expense it entails to overwhelm the private fortune of the distinguished Patriot ?

“ FELLOW-CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN !—The question for you to consider is this—Are the services of O’CONNELL requisite for the amelioration of Ireland ? Is his powerful assistance necessary in annihilating tithes—in extinguishing Corporate misgovernment—in rescuing the nation from the fangs of faction—in pouring balm into the wounds of his unhappy country, and in spreading over his native land that gladness and prosperity for which his patriot heart so loudly pants. It he be necessary, then, respond to this appeal of your country. You cannot, it is true, weigh your gratitude in the scales, and give him an equivalent—that is impossible—You cannot recompense him for his services—that he does not require.—The applause of a self-approving conscience, the undying gratitude of a nation, an imperishable fame in this world, and immortality of happiness in the next, are the rewards worthy of his aspirations. But Ireland, in the name of common justice, calls upon you to give some equivalent for the Professional income he has given up, and to protect his private property from being consumed in his endeavour to ameliorate the condition of your Country. You must enable him to maintain the position in which your confidence has placed him—without your assistance his private fortune would sink under the expenses which that political elevation demands.

“ FELLOW-CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN !—It is unnecessary to press further these reflections upon you.—Your determination is already taken—you still call for the assistance of Ireland’s Liberator ; and you have too strong a sense of justice not to offer him some recompense for the pecuniary sacrifices he has made, and for the enormous expenses he has to endure.

“ Sunday, the 15th November next, is the day appointed for the payment of this national engagement ; and Ireland looks, with a confiding eye, to you, fellow-citizens and countrymen, convinced that you will be now, as you have ever been, amongst the foremost in this great effort—to preserve the political influence of our great Patriot, and to enable him to bear up against the burdens which that very influence produces. In this effort you will be assisted by the untiring friends of Ireland—the Catholic Clergy—who, feeling deeply her wrongs, and knowing well her interests, have never failed in promoting this great national Tribute.”

CHAPTER III.

1836---1837.

We point, with truth, to the year 1836, as the one when O'CONNELL's influence in Parliament and out, in England and in Ireland, was at its height. His own countrymen placed implicit confidence in him, and quietly abandoned a cherished object, "the Repeal of the Union," on his advice, and in order to give his experiment on English justice fair scope. In England, the people were grateful to him, principally for their Parliamentary and Municipal reforms. STANLEY, in 1831, acknowledged, in Mr. SHIEL's presence, that the English Reform would never have been carried but for the Irish majority, and in 1835, the Municipal Bill would not have become law, but for the same influence. The majority of the English representatives were against them. The Government, as Lord MELBOURNE acknowledged in the House of Lords, were most desirous, without compromise, to conciliate a man of such enormous power over the people of both countries. With some of the Ministers there existed personal feelings against him. We don't think either Lord MELBOURNE, Lord JOHN RUSSELL, SPRING RICE, or HOBHOUSE, were over anxious for personal intimacy. They knew him merely as a public man—the language which he occasionally used in public was distasteful to them. The outcry too against the Government, as the humble slave

to the Irish agitator, galled their pride, and though they felt that his co-operation was essential to their continuance in power, still no personal intimacy existed. Not so with the Irish Viceroy, the Chief Secretary and Lord DUNCANNON. With these he was intimate; and they were gratified in complimenting the representative of the popular will, disregarding the sneers of the Conservatives, and their organs. With Lord MORPETH and Lord DUNCANNON he was particularly intimate, and certainly the intimacy was creditable to all—to O'CONNELL—that he should have been appreciated by the very cream of the Whig party—and to them, that they, in the midst of an outcry which was never before raised against one individual—showed themselves as able to estimate the private virtues, as they were desirous of securing the public co-operation of the most powerful subject in the Empire.—O'CONNELL was powerful, because of the very wrongs of Ireland, but he was made doubly so by the hostility of the Conservatives to his country, because of their hatred to him. We will see, in the course of this year, 1836, how Municipal Reform for Ireland was retarded, because, avowedly, of this bitter personal feeling. The more their rights were refused on this account, the more the people clung to him with fidelity and affection, the more determined were they to do his bidding in the minutest particular. Hence, the extraordinary quiet which reigned throughout Ireland during these years. Though there never was a compact between O'CONNELL and the Whigs—for this he, and Lord MELBOURNE both, utterly and emphatically, denied, still there was, undoubtedly, a coalition—O'CONNELL exerting his great power to sustain the government, on the faith of their anxiety to do justice to Ireland, and, on the other hand, the Ministers, as far as the controlling influence in the Lords would allow, anxious to

carry out extensive reforms, equally in Ireland as England. The characters of three men in the Government, more immediately connected with Ireland were, to O'CONNELL, a guarantee for this. Lord MULGRAVE was lion-like in moral courage. He was honest, and was almost radical in his views. There never was in public life a purer, a more upright, a higher minded Statesman, than Lord MORPETH, and Lord DUNCANNON was a thorough friend to his country. It was part and parcel of his nature to love her. The disposition came to him from his ancestors. It was hereditary. His good sense, in addition to this, made him see, that, as an Irish proprietor, it was his private interest to raise her condition, and his political principles made him abhor both civil monopoly and religious ascendancy.

Such was the position in which O'CONNELL was placed, when, in 1836, after spending his usual vacation in the usual way, he emerged from the mountains, and opened a new agitation for JUSTICE TO IRELAND. He commenced at Tralce early in January, where he was entertained at a public dinner. He then was present at a similar demonstration of confidence at Stradbally, in the Queen's County—then at Moate—in Tuam—and, on the twenty-seventh of January, he was entertained at a great banquet at Morrison's Hotel, Dublin, Lord MILTOWN presiding. Nothing could exceed the reception O'CONNELL met with at this dinner of Reformers. He was surrounded by the *elite* of the Irish Liberals. His speech, on the occasion, was eloquent, without effort. It was, by turns, playful and serious, and may be considered a fair specimen of his easy, unpretending style, without any ornament or any attempt at oratorical flights. It was at this dinner that he denied the Lichfield House compact. "Our hearty concurrence" he said, "in the projects of men, who have the good of Ireland at heart, they, the Tories, term a

“ *coalition*. We have not coalesced with the Ministers up to this period. I deny it, but we are going now to coalesce. We proclaim our intention, let them prate treason as they will.” In furtherance of his views on this subject, he obtained from the Repeal party in Dublin, and during his tour through the provinces, permission to abandon Repeal if justice was obtained. On this subject at the Trades’ Union in Dublin he spoke as follows —:

“ I go to England to work out justice for Ireland. If I get that justice do you consent that I shall abandon Repeal? I put that question to the men of Kerry, and I got an answer in the affirmative. I put the same question in Tuam, and I got the same reply. I put the same question in Moate, and I got the same reply. I put it also to the honest men of the Queen’s County, and they gave me the same answer. I now put that question to you? I want you to strengthen me with your authority, that I may go and tell the English people that I am authorised to make that bargain with them. Have I your authority? I promise you I will make no niggard bargain for you. You shall have full 20s in the pound of the real national debt of justice. You shall have, for your trades, employment; agriculture in Ireland must be encouraged—manufactures must be extended—the corporations must be opened, and the blessings of equal law must be secured to all.”

In giving the toast of “the People” at St Bridget’s Charity dinner, at which he presided two days before the meeting of the Trades, he explains most fully his views on this critical policy respecting REPEAL. It is, therefore, most necessary that these views should be here fully developed:—

“For my part I must say that I do not despair of justice—I never yet despaired in Ireland—but I confess I shall look with horror at the prospects of the future, if any

change were to take place in the administration. In my late agitation, the flattering kindness of my friends gave me an opportunity of sounding public opinion in various parts of Ireland—at a public dinner in Kerry—a public dinner in Tuam—at one on a small scale in Moate, and at one of great magnitude in Stradbally. I am sorry to say—and it is indeed unpleasant to me to do so—but I am bound to say, that the public have not had any thing like an accurate account of what occurred on these occasions. What appeared in the newspapers was of so condensed a nature, and so curtailed an account one way or other, that very little notion, indeed, of what was really said could be conveyed by it. My reason for thus alluding to the fact is, that, in these four places, I put, distinctly to the meeting, a question, and as distinctly received an answer at each place to the following effect, which I was anxious should get publicity :—I asked them whether, if they obtained justice from an united parliament, they would authorise me to say, that, in that case, the agitation of the repeal question should be given up.—Well, to this they unanimously responded in the affirmative, in Kerry; they were equally unanimous in Tuam, and gave a similar response in Moate and Stradbally—I mean on Monday next to put the same question to the Trades' Political Union, and I doubt not that I shall receive the same answer. And why do I desire to be thus authorised? Not, certainly, that it will furnish me with the belief that an united parliament will do justice; for I honestly confess I don't think it will; but I want to make the experiment of going to them with the authority of the Irish people, and saying, that I am desired to state that they will give up the agitation of repeal upon one condition and upon one condition *only*—that of having justice done to Ireland—I have heard of some squeamish persons also saying, that I should not avow myself a Repealer now. It is really cruel, that,

after 30 years of agitation, they do not yet know me. This brings to my mind the question of Emancipation, which we were told over and over again would be granted, but for the fear that existed of our looking for something else, while I, at the very same time, declared that I was looking for something else; that I had ulterior motives in seeking to obtain that measure, and that I only looked upon it as a means to an end. I knew that Ireland would never obtain justice until Catholic Emancipation was conceded, and I said so. I knew that that was the first step towards producing a perfect equality of rights and privileges amongst all classes of British subjects, and procuring justice, and an equalization of advantages for Ireland. My conviction then was, that this could not be obtained but from a domestic legislature, and such being known to be my opinion, I found many to cry out, 'for heaven's sake be discreet.' 'I cannot be discreet,' I replied, 'if I must be so at the expense of a fact which ought to be stated; for it never shall be said that I concealed from those in power, that my ulterior views are linked with the question of Repeal.' When Emancipation was obtained, I accordingly sought for Repeal; because I saw that the Imperial Parliament paid very little attention to the affairs or condition of Ireland. Even Sir R. PEELE himself confessed, he could not get forty members together, when an Irish question was to be brought forward. I, however, took up the Repeal, and, like the flappers we read of in 'Gulliver's Travels,' I rattled it about their ears—the result of which is, that the attention of Government is almost entirely engrossed with the affairs of Ireland.

“ Indeed all their attention is requisite, for their duty is great. They have a duty of seven centuries to perform, not the least point of which will be, to abolish that most

abominable of all systems, by which seven millions of people are compelled to pay for the support of a clergy, from the doctrines of whose church they dissent. In looking for Repeal, both houses of Parliament promised, that, if that question were given up, they would grant every other which could be proved to be advantageous to Ireland. This they pledged themselves to, provided their attention was permitted to be withdrawn from opposing Repeal, by our abandoning the agitation of that question in Ireland; and I am now for making the experiment, whether that is a real and *bona fide* reason on their part, or a mere pretence. I have gotten the authority, I may say, of two divisions; nay, I will say of all Ireland, to state this to the Government, and people of England, 'Your paper Union we care not for—your parchment Union we care not for—give us a union of prosperity, and the rights of justice, and of benefits, for to such an union are we ready to concede—place us on an equality with yourselves, and then talk to me of an union, for then will I offer you, in the name of the Irish people, not to talk of repeal; but, unless you do that, thank heaven, we have seven millions of people to fall back upon the question of repeal again. The people of Ireland are ready to become a portion of the empire, provided they be made so in reality and not in name alone; they are ready to become a kind of West Britons, if made so in benefits and in justice; but if not, we are Irishmen again.'

We cannot, acting like an impartial jury, sworn to decide according to the evidence, for such is the position the honest commentator on political events is placed in—we cannot, judging from the experience we now possess, and influenced by the conviction that no amount of justice, awarded by an English Parliament, would render

unnecessary a domestic Legislature ; we cannot now approve of the policy adopted by O'CONNELL. We believe, that, if the Repeal agitation had been then vigorously carried on, without regard to political parties, we should not have had to wait so many years for justice, and that both Houses of Parliament would have been forced to carry out their pledges; nay more, that they would have long since come to some settlement as regards the reconstruction of an Irish Parliament. We are quite satisfied that, could O'CONNELL have foreseen how little was to be achieved by this quiescent policy, he never would have pursued it. Lord MELBOURNE and Lord JOHN RUSSELL were decided supporters of a Church establishment. From them how could a full measure of justice be had for Ireland? O'CONNELL'S own special favorite, Lord MORPETH, denied him an extension of the suffrage, because he was afraid of the Conservative opposition.— Every measure they brought in was transformed, by the House of Lords, into a meagre, miserable pittance of justice, not worth accepting, because there was not incessantly the cry for domestic legislation—for, Repeal, and nothing but Repeal, disturbing their security.— O'CONNELL'S plan, through life, was to accept, whenever he could get it, an instalment of justice. The plan was, generally speaking, a wise one, because every political reform carried, and every social amelioration achieved were but additional instruments to fight, constitutionally, the battle for a home Parliament. But we think these could have been obtained without relinquishing the Repeal agitation. The Whigs maintained that the demand for Repeal originated, and was perpetuated by the grievances of which the Irish justly complained. To get rid of it, they would have strained every nerve to remedy these evils ; and the louder the cry for a Parliament in College Green, the more anxious would they have been to yield justice to

Ireland, It may be true, that the Repeal pledge may have given to the Tories some seats in Ireland. If it did, it would not have been to any material extent—the Whig majority may have been lessened; but so much the better for O'CONNELL and the people, for, the smaller that majority, the better at all times for Ireland, for then the Irish Representatives become the arbiters of the affairs of the empire. It gives them the power of coercing Government into justice. It was the smallness of the Whig majority, from 1835 to 1839, that gave O'CONNELL the Parliamentary power he possessed. In 1833, when Lord GREY's Government had so sweeping a majority, he was scarcely listened to in the House of Commons. It is true that the House of Lords took courage, by reason of the state of parties in the Commons, and continued, for years, the system of obstruction. But this could not have endured. The Upper House could never, against the will of the people, have continued in permanent opposition to their representatives. Victory must, sooner or later, have been at the side of justice; and the more, during the struggle, the claims of Ireland were discussed, the more would the people of England have insisted on that justice, and, the more readily, the more they apprehended that the alternative would be a dissolution of the connexion between themselves and Ireland. Even for the subordinate purpose of wresting justice from our rulers, the Repeal agitation perseveringly upheld, would have been invaluable—and, when we consider how essential for the natural prosperity is a home Parliament, and how difficult is its attainment, the risk should never have been run, of its never again reviving, once it was allowed to subside. Nothing but the folly of Lord EBRINGTON, and the mad hostility of SUGDEN, and Lord DE GREY, coming to the aid of the renewed

Agitation, would ever have aroused the people from the apathy, which this abandonment of Repeal had produced. These are the views, judging from the subsequent events, which we are induced to take of the quiescent policy of 1835—36. At the time, our confidence in the wisdom of our great leader, and our admiration of the manly and fearless demeanour of Lord MULGRAVE, made us cordially concur in the "Justice, or else——" policy of O'CONNELL.

There was another circumstance which occurred this year, that, in our opinion, materially cramped the political power of O'CONNELL, or at least, took an instrument out of his hands, which, in time of extreme need, he could effectively wield. O'CONNELL became a Banker, He became the founder, patron, and governor of the National Bank of Ireland. His hands became at once bound up; and what he did in 1833, he dared not do when he became tied up with the monetary system. He could not cry out "To stop the Duke, run for gold." We know that nothing but the extreme of oppression, or a dogged determination to refuse Justice to Ireland, would justify an expedient, that must, when employed, do injury to a considerable extent. But the knowledge that the Nation's leader possessed such an instrument of defence was, in itself, sufficient to prevent a continued denial of its rights. For instance, when in August, 1838, it was found that the House still continued to refuse to Ireland a Municipal Reform, of far less dimensions than that given to England in 1835, and to Scotland in 1832, the writer of this Memoir drew up the following Address to Mr. O'CONNELL. It was unanimously signed by some of the leading Merchants in Cork, and forwarded to him:—

“ TO DANIEL O’CONNELL, ESQ., M.P.

“ SIR—Ireland, amidst the sufferings, the privations, the indignities she endures, has ever turned a confiding eye towards you, her valued and untiring Patriot, and sought for advice and assistance from your master intellect, your exertions, and your experience.

“ Yielding to your councils, the Irish Nation have passively and patiently suffered insults and contumely, in order that they should not, by act or expression, mar your great experiment on the justice of England.

“ For three years has that experiment been tried—for three years have we been extending our suppliant hands, willing to receive even crumbs of justice from our rich, but inexorable neighbour—for three years have we been offering to the Sister Kingdom the benefits of a cordial alliance, on the humiliating condition of receiving, through her selfishness, some paltry concession of political rights.

“ But England, true to the principles of despotism by which she has acted towards Ireland—actuated by that enduring and hereditary hatred she has ever nurtured towards this unhappy country, which in the pride of superiority she has insulted, injured and impoverished—encouraged, in her antipathies, by that black and malignant faction which was generated by, and fattens on the foul corruptions, that, like a plague spot, have fastened on the spirits and energies of the Irish people—England, thus influenced, turns an unwilling ear to our supplications. She refuses concession—she tells the Tithe Proctor to prowl over the land, and continue his depredations, and she bids the factious Corporator to keep alive religious rancour—to encourage discord, and to feed upon the plunder exacted from a harrassed people.

“ Sir, we respectfully submit that the ‘ experiment’

is complete, and the result, as you anticipated, is, that from England no justice can be expected. To ourselves, and ourselves alone, must we look for working out peaceably, constitutionally, but determinedly, the regeneration of our country.

“ It is evident to the thinking mind who can read the signs of the times, and calculate from their aspect the probabilities of the future, that the parchment Union between England and Ireland must be ultimately dissolved. The religious prejudices—the antipathies—the selfish jealousy of England will never permit the cordial approximation, on the broad principles of equality, of the two Countries, and on no other basis can the Union be endured by eight and half millions of thinking beings.

Who know their rights, and knowing—dare maintain them.’

We therefore deem it a corollary indisputable, that sooner or later, the Act of Union must be ‘ flung to the winds,’ and Ireland become a free and independent kingdom, but we cannot conceal from you our conviction, that many years must roll by before that desirable result can be attained. Many of us will have passed away, and amongst the many the man of all others who deserves most to witness the accomplishment of his wishes and exertions, in the contentment and amelioration of Ireland.

“ Pending the Repeal of the Union, we respectfully submit for your consideration an intermediate plan, which, if carried into general operation through your instrumentality, must be effectual in wresting from the reluctant hand of England, speedy and ample justice for our ill-fated country. It is the plan which marked the origin of the American Revolution, and led to American independence. It is the plan which was partially carried into effect by yourself in Clare, and just now put into operation in the County of Wexford—it is the plan of arousing an organised de-

termination, amongst the whole Irish nation, of abstaining from the consumption of ALL TAXED ARTICLES.

“ If this can be effectuated through your advice and influence, three great results will be obtained.—It will exhibit the union—the determination—the moral power—the heroism, and the injured feelings of an entire people. It will tend without the aid of hypocrisy or cant, to eradicate the injurious habits and elevate the moral character of our Countrymen, and it will lessen, by four millions sterling, the receipt of the English Exchequer. It will thus touch England in her most sensitive part, the *pocket*, and force from her an immediate compliance with Ireland’s just and moderate demands.

“ Sir, we cannot doubt, for a single moment, the spirit and determination of an insulted and injured people, when we bear in mind that this Memorial is subscribed by several large producers of exciseable manufactures, and many retailers of taxed commodities, who thus willingly sacrifice their private interests, in the hope of its ultimately producing, what we all so fondly anticipate, the political amelioration of our Country. The undersigned will all cheerfully abandon the comforts—the enjoyments—nay, the necessaries of life, rather than swell, from Irish resources, the finances of haughty and ungrateful England. Let her show a disposition to act fairly, impartially, and justly towards Ireland, and we shall willingly assist, in proportion to our means, in defraying the enormous charges by which she is pressed down, but as long as she refuses, in return for the civil liberties Ireland has won for her, to aid us in obtaining equal political freedom, so long shall we refrain from contributing to her revenue or bearing any share of her burden.

“ To your influence—your patriotism, and your great practical experience, do we look with confidence for the

accomplishment of this peaceable and bloodless project.

“ If it meet your approbation, it must and will succeed. Call on your Countrymen. Your advice will be followed, and through the instrumentality of this great national abstinence, Ireland may yet, within the period of a single year, work out her political regeneration.— It is a weapon she can easily and effectually wield, without destroying human life, or impeding national prosperity. It requires but the will: If she refuse, let her abandon the Repeal of the Union, for she has not sufficient moral resolution to be free.

“ We have the honor to be, Sir, your grateful and devoted Countrymen,

“———,”

Now, never, as will be seen, when we come to treat of it, was there a period when some such policy—though it may have injured many interests, particularly the Banking interest—there never was a period when some such policy was more called for, to demonstrate the determination of the people. There was a time, we are convinced, when Mr. O'CONNELL would have originated such a course, but influenced by, no doubt, most prudential reasons, and shackled by his anxiety for the prosperity of the Bank, with which he was connected, he flung away a most powerful and effective political instrument. O'CONNELL's reason for thus connecting himself with the Banking system of the country was because of the monopoly—the religious monopoly—carried out in the management of the Bank of Ireland, and because of the political influence exercised by that establishment. These were undoubtedly good reasons for getting up such a Company as the National Bank of Ireland, provided always that it was an Irish Bank; for, undoubtedly, if the profits derived by such establishments from the mercantile transactions of Ireland, are remitted to Eng-

land, then such profits become a tribute, paid by Irish industry, to English capital. In that respect the Bank of Ireland, being national, has the advantage of either of the other two great companies. But be that as it may, for it is beside the question, we assert, as a truism, that a political agitator leading on millions, in a peaceful course, to obtain from a reluctant legislature their rights, should be unwholly unshackled and freed from a monetary system, the great principle of which is to leave things as they are, not to risk ruffling the surface of society, and to bear existing ills sooner than encounter unknown evils. In the ordinary affairs of life, these maxims may do well; but when a nation is struggling for justice, its leader should have no connexion with such a system. We therefore, always, since 1836, felt that there was an inconsistency in O'CONNELL'S position as Governor of a Bank.

O'CONNELL, full of the confidence of his countrymen, and authorised to do what he deemed most conducive to their interests, left Dublin in the last week of January, 1836, to meet the Reformers of Liverpool and Birmingham at public entertainments, to be given to him, in gratitude for his exertions in the struggle for English Municipal Reform. Nothing could be more splendid than the festive demonstrations in both these great cities. The great room in the Corn Exchange, in Liverpool, was appropriated for the purpose there. It is one hundred and twenty feet long, by sixty broad, and accommodated, at twenty-nine tables, nearly one thousand persons. Mr. WILLIAM RATHBONE, one of the leading reformers in the city, an eminent merchant, and lately known in Ireland for his benevolence in connexion with the American contributions to the relief of our distress, presided on the occasion. O'CONNELL, at that banquet, said to the assembled Englishmen, by whom he was enthusiasti-

cally received—"Here I am, authorised to give up the "question of Repeal, if you will be just towards Ireland."

In Birmingham, he was entertained in the Town Hall, "one of the noblest structures in the kingdom." About the same number dined as in Liverpool. The Mayors of several of the surrounding towns, of Worcester, Warwick, Leicester, &c., attended to compliment the great Irish Reformer. Mr. MUNTZ, now member for Birmingham, filled the chair. Here he repeated the same statement, regarding Repeal, as he did at Liverpool. Then appealing to the sense of justice of Englishmen, he said :—

"We have stood by you in your contests, and we are ready to do so again. When the meteor flag of England was borne forward to victory, amidst slaughter, death, and carnage of thousands—when shouts of triumph have issued from British decks—and they have done so for a thousand years, and will continue to do so for a thousand more—when they have been heard in the battle plain, and o'er the vasty deep—when the stream of British blood flowed in fullest tide to British glory and British fame, did the life-current of the sons of Ireland flow less copiously or less warmly in the cause than yours—yours, whose dearer rights were battled for? We want to be your brothers, and to stand by your side. What! are you to have all the spoils of victory, and we nothing but the blows? Forbid it, English honor, and English interests. There are many things to be done for you yet. Your Corporate reform bill requires to be amended. Here we are! Your franchise requires to be extended. Here we are! Your honest and industrious classes require to be protected by the ballot; and here we are! Let us then rally together—England, Ireland, and Scotland—Scotland, Ireland, and England. I am the apostle of that sect of political religionists who have been

deeply convinced, as I have ever been, of the possibility of completing every amelioration—of achieving every necessary change, without the least destruction of a particle of property, or the shedding of one drop of human blood. I want no revolution in the social state, that could create the least distress amongst families, unless indeed it might affect the families of plunderers. I require improvement for the sake of society—in the great institutions of the country, I require a movement forward, and if I be asked where will I stop, my answer shall be that I will stop when I find that British ingenuity ceases to increase the strength of her steam, and the facility of her locomotive powers—advantages, which, combined with her great industry and her skill, have raised her above all the nations of the earth. Yes, the moment she ceases to improve her manufacturing interests, will I stop my present progressive movement towards political justice.”

At Birmingham, deputations from different towns waited on him, with addresses—a grand Charity Breakfast was given to him, for the benefit of the Catholic Poor Schools of the town. In fine, every compliment, which a well-disposed and enthusiastic people could pay, as paid Mr. O'CONNELL during this visit to England. It was at the Charity Breakfast that he declared, that he was most anxious to coalesce with the Government, but that they were unwilling to do so. So exalted was the position which O'CONNELL now filled, that every sentence he uttered at these entertainments, was published in all the London Journals, to the great mortification of the *Standard*, which complained, bitterly, that to gratify so vile a taste, and meet so unnatural a demand, its columns had to be crowded with such effusions.

Parliament was opened, on the 4th of February, by a speech from the throne, in which it was called upon to

legislate on the tithe question, and to extend, to Ireland, the benefits of Municipal Reform. The battle of the Session commenced on the address. The address assured his MAJESTY, that the Commons would endeavour to apply to Ireland, the same principles of Municipal Reform as those of the acts already given to England and Scotland. Sir ROBERT PEEL moved the following amendment:—"That the House would apply such remedies, as may obviate all just causes of complaint, and insure the impartial administration of justice." The meaning of which turned out to be, the abolition of Municipal Corporations, to prevent their being converted into what O'CONNELL said they should become—"normal schools of agitation," and thereby increase his already overgrown influence.

O'CONNELL made one of his best Parliamentary speeches on this debate. He told the Commons of England that if the address, in its original form, were rejected, he would go back on Repeal. He concluded this brilliant address by saying:—

"Allusion had been made to the power and influence which he possessed. That power he derived from public opinion; and what, he asked, created that opinion? Injustice inflicted upon Ireland. Those who were adverse to his possessing that power, could weaken—could destroy it. Let them only do justice to Ireland. But let them refuse that justice, and they wounded the country to the heart's core—they shook to the very base, the throne of the Monarch, for which they professed their respect, and they weakened that union which they appeared anxious to perpetuate. They had vaunted their determination to support that union, 'even to the death;' and there were the Irish people now ready to go with them and support it 'to the death,' upon the condition, however, that equal justice should be done to them with the people

of England and Scotland. Until that justice, however, was done, they would not cease to seek for it; and if it could not be obtained from England, they must seek it for themselves. Every man who heard him now must acknowledge that the course he was adopting, in asking for it, was the proper and constitutional one. They might condemn as much as they pleased the course he adopted elsewhere—but that which he now did must surely meet with their approbation. Honourable members on the opposite side, might taunt him, and the Ministry, if they would, with having formed a coalition. They might renew against him that prejudice that used to exist against an Irishman and a Papist; they might send around their minions to sow discord and disaffection—to pour out calumny and slander—calling themselves, the while, Ministers of the God of Charity—still they could not evade the question really before the House, which lay in an exceedingly narrow compass; he demanded for Ireland, in the spirit of the Constitution, equal justice—the advantages of the same principles of Government as were extended to England and Scotland; he would not take less. They might grant it with advantage—they would refuse it at their peril.”

The original address was carried by a majority of FORTY-ONE.

O'CONNELL went up, in company with other Members, with the address to the KING. It is said that he was regularly besieged, by the ladies of the Court, for his autographs. Such, at that moment, in England, was the unexampled elevation in public opinion which he had attained.

His opinion, expressed in Parliament, respecting the establishment of Poor Law Commissioners in Ireland, is worthy of notice. The observations were elicited, on a

motion of Sir RICHARD MUSGRAVE'S, on the subject of Irish Poor Laws. Mr. O'CONNELL then said:—

“The time was come for introducing poor laws into Ireland. There was a machinery of centralization in the English poor law, as amended, which worked well. The tribunal composed of Commissioners was a great benefit, and in any plan that may be proposed for Ireland, a similar tribunal would, in his opinion, be desirable.—It would tend greatly to prevent those local prejudices and party feelings, which might arise in parishes and districts, when any measure of relief began for the first time to come into operation. The sooner the subject was taken up the better. Any measure of relief ought to embrace some provision to facilitate emigration. To give relief to able-bodied labourers, from the poor fund, would do far more injury than good. One mode of relief might be found in the allocation of unimproved lands. Some caution, however, would be necessary in the application of such a remedy, because, if carried too far, it would have the effect of increasing the number of poor in succeeding generations. When Ireland was in full possession of equal rights, he had no doubt that a general amelioration of the condition of all classes in that country would, before long, manifest itself, and that much of the distress which now called for a measure of this kind, would disappear. It was his wish that relief should be provided for the actually destitute, without at all interfering with the wages of labour, a practice that had been found so injurious.”

It is clear, from every thing which fell at this period from Mr. O'CONNELL, in reference to this very question of Irish Poor Laws, that he yielded, reluctantly, to the pressure of public opinion, in giving his adhesion to the measure at all, and his own opinion never materially altered. When he assented to the project, he adopted it accompanied with the English machinery of centralization.

We are not disposed, from our experience, to find fault with this centralization. It was absolutely necessary at the first introduction of the measure, which was one of mere experiment, and a doubtful one to boot; and so long as the rate payers in Ireland continue so parsimonious in their conduct to the destitute, it is necessary that a central authority should exist, to protect the inmates in the Work-House, and secure for them a sufficient maintenance.

A most interesting subject, in which O'CONNEL took a part, was introduced by Mr. SHIEL, early in the Session. It was in respect to the celebrated Writs of Rebellion, invented, or rather drawn out of the archives of the legal archeologist, to assist the Clergy to obtain their tithes, by a safe process in the Court of Exchequer. These writs of rebellion were commissions issued from that Court, in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to any persons the plaintiff selected, enabling them to arrest the parties against whom they were issued.— This writ could issue without previous personal notice. Placarding the notice on the Church, or Chapel door, or Market place, was considered sufficient substitution of service. Once the writs issued, the persons named as Commissioners, could demand the assistance of the Police, and any constable or officer refusing to assist, was subject to attachment. There was then in Ireland a society called “the Lay Association, for the protection of the property of the Established Church.” This Society undertook the issuing out these writs of rebellion against all tithe defaulters—no matter how small the demand. The costs following the process were enormous. In one case, in which the Lay Association issued a writ, the Commissioner, DUDLEY, called upon a constable MALONE for assistance. By direction of Major MILLER, of the Constabulary force, MALONE refused to

act. The Attorney-General defended MALONE and Major MILLER, before the Court of Exchequer, for their refusal. But an attachment was granted against them. This matter was brought before the House of Commons. Mr. SHEIL, Sergeant JACKSON, Mr. O'CONNELL, and Dr. LEFROY, were the chief disputants. O'CONNELL was unsparing in his denunciation of the whole proceeding, which he said "was a political, not a judicial one, because he believed the writ of rebellion was revived, not for remedy but for vengeance." It was, however, afterwards admitted that the CHIEF BARON'S law was good; namely, that the writs of rebellion were legal, and the right to demand assistance undeniable.

The Irish Municipal Bill was early introduced into Parliament this year, 1836. It was met by the Tories, with the proposition for the abolition, instead of the reconstruction, of the Corporations. This amendment was moved by Lord FRANCIS EGERTON, now Lord ELLESMERE, and was supported, with all his tact and plausibility, by Sir ROBERT PEEL. After a very able statement from Sir MICHAEL O'LOUGHLAN, and a reply from Sir ROBERT PEEL, stating his views and intentions, the bill was read a second time without a division. On the House going into committee, Lord FRANCIS EGERTON moved, as instruction to the Committee—"that it (the Committee) should make provision for the abolition of Corporations, and, on their abolition, for securing the efficient and impartial administration of justice, and the peace and good government of the cities and towns in Ireland." On this arose the first party struggle for the Session. O'CONNELL distinguished himself, on this occasion, by a most masterly speech. It is not easy to give an outline of it. It was not a prepared didactic discourse, the arguments in which could be traced step by step. It was an extempore, brilliant display,

full of wit, sarcasm, argument, and eloquence; all springing up, spontaneously, from the resources of a richly cultivated mind. He demanded the substitution, for the existing Corporations, of a body, identical in its principle with that which had been given to England and Scotland. He taunted GOULBURN and PEEL, with allowing the continuance of the abuses, which they now admitted to exist, of the old Corporations. He observed Lord STANLEY, during his speech, taking notes to reply to him, and he exclaimed—"I see the noble Lord, dipping his pen in ink—he may dip it in gall, if he chooses, but he cannot weaken the position that I have taken." He taunted Sir ROBERT PEEL with his plan of equality between Catholic and Protestant,—namely, lowering the Protestant to a level with the Catholic, by depriving him of the right of self-government, which he always possessed; instead of raising the Catholic on an equality with the Protestant, by removing all impediments to his enjoying all these municipal privileges. He spoke, in a defiant tone, of the consequences of the refusal to do this act of justice to Ireland. He told them that, not only the Repeal of the Act of Union, but even the separation of both countries, would be the result. His speech which occupied over an hour in the delivery, was one of the best he ever made within the walls of Parliament. Lord STANLEY replied to this speech. The reply was an able one. The only argument, however, he put forward, or, indeed, that was used by any one in the Session, was of a personal character—namely, that the Reform of Municipal Corporations, in Ireland, would increase O'CONNELL'S power, by the establishment of "normal schools for agitation." He taunted the Government with their subservience to the Irish leader, and concluded his speech with the following quotation, amidst the enthusiastic shouts of his party :—

" But shall it be, that you...that set the crown
 Upon the head of this forgetful man,
 And, for his sake, wear the detested blot
 Of murd'rous subordination...shall it be,
 That you a world of curses undergo ;
 Being the agents, or base second means,
 The cords, the ladder, or the hangman rather !...
 O, pardon me, that I descend so low,
 To show the line and the predicament,
 Wherein you range under this subtle king...
 Shall it, for shame, be spoken in these days,
 Or fill up chronicle in time to come,
 That men of your nobility and power,
 Did gage them both in so unjust behalf ?"

* * * * *

Lord FRANCIS EGERTON'S motion was rejected by a majority of SIXTY-FOUR.

The Tories, not having succeeded in their scheme of abolition, moved, on the motion for the third reading, that it should be read a third time on that day six-months—This motion was made by Mr. Recorder SHAW. On this occasion, the great speech of the debate was SHIEL'S—It was a truly brilliant effort, Sir ROBERT PEEL, on the occasion, said of him—" His talents and his eloquence invest all he utters with a charm of a powerful character, and Ireland should be justly proud of his genius." We think the peroration of this remarkable speech will be read with deep interest. It is as follows :—

" In 1829, the member for Tamworth declared, in his emancipation speech, that Roman Catholics should be invested with all municipal privileges ; there are accordingly two sections in his Emancipation Act to that effect: From that day to this, not a single Roman Catholic has had the benefit of those clauses in the Act of Parliament. By passive resistance, a Protestant passive resistance, the law has been frustrated and baffled. The right hon. baronet gave us a key that would not turn the lock ; and when

British justice is about to burst open the doors, he would level the institutions to the earth, and bury our rights, his own Act of Emancipation—(God forbid that I should add, his dignity and good faith)—under the ruins. Sir, the hon. gentleman appears to me to adhere to his old Irish policy, and although he carried emancipation in obedience to his reason, he is acting on emancipation, in compliance with those religious instincts which he ought to get under his control. In the course of the last session, I ventured to address myself to him in the language of strenuous, but most unaffectedly respectful expostulation. I presumed to entreat of him to take a retrospect of his Irish policy, and to inquire from him whether of every failing, and every failure, he did not in his Irish policy find the cause. I told him that Ireland had a grave ready for his administration, and that grave soon closed upon it. I should not venture to advert to what I then said, but what has since befallen has given to those observations a remarkable confirmation. The moment the session of Parliament terminated, the subordinates of the right hon. Baronet commenced the ‘No-Popery’ cry. The result of that pious enterprise has corresponded with his deserts. The Parliament assembles, and at the very outset, the right hon. Baronet tries his fortune on Irish ground again, by moving an amendment, and he is at once and signally defeated. A few days elapse, and he sustains a still more conspicuous discomfiture. Not in order to give way to a feeling of glorious exultation, do I refer to the dissolution of the Orange Society, but for the purpose of showing the ‘sweet uses’ of which adversity is susceptible, and leaving out the offensive epithets in the citation, to point to the ‘bright and precious jewel’ it contains. It was a vast and most powerful incorporation, including 100,000 armed men, with individuals of the highest station

among its leaders, a prince of the blood royal at its head. Where is it now? Can you not derive admonition from its fall? You have seen administration after administration dissolved by the power of the Irish people;—by the power of the Irish people, you have seen your own Cabinet dashed to pieces; and now, struck to the heart, you behold your own gigantic auxiliary laid low. Taught so long, but uninstructed still, wherefore, in the same fatal policy, with an infatuated pertinacity, do you disastrously persevere? You think, perhaps, that emancipation has failed. Six years in a nation's life are less than as many minutes of individual duration. You have not given it, what you asked for yourself, a fair trial, and have yourself, to a certain extent, counteracted its operations. At the very outset, you entered into a struggle with the son of the earth, 'who has rebounded with fresh vigour from every fall,' and, notwithstanding all your experience—although injustice carries with it the principle of self-frustration—although the poisoned chalice is sure, in its inevitable circulation, to return to the lips of those by whom it is compounded—still adhering to your fatal policy, and haunted by your O'CONNELLISM—still, instead of rising to the height of the great arguments, and ascending to a point of moral and political elevation, from which you could see wide and far, you behold nothing but the objects which, by their closeness become magnified, and have nothing but the fear of O'CONNELL before your eyes. You do not legislate for a people, but against a man. Even if I were to admit that he had been occasionally hurried into excesses, for which your impolicy should in reality be responsible, give me leave to ask, whether millions of his fellow-countrymen and your fellow-citizens, and generations yet unborn, must pay the penalty? Granting him a life as Ireland can pray, and his adversaries can deprecate,

will he be not survived by the statute books? Have you made him immortal as well as omnipotent? Is your legislation to be built on considerations transitory as the breath with which he speaks, and are the miserable structures which should last for ages, to have no better basis than the miserable antipathies by which we are distracted? Let us remember, in the discharge of the great judiciary functions that are imposed on us, that we are not only the trustees of great contemporary interests, but of the welfare of those by whom we are to be succeeded; that our measures are in some sort testamentary, and that we bequeath to posterity a blessing or a bane; and impressed with that high, and I do not exaggerate, when I call it that holy consciousness, yet let us have a care lest to a sentiment of miserable partiality we should give way. To distinctions between Catholic and Protestant, let there be an end. Let there be an end to national animosities, as well as to national detestation. Perish the bad theology that inverts the Scriptures, makes God according to man's image, and, with infernal passions, fills the heart of man; perish the bad nationality, that substitutes, for the genuine love of country, a feeling of despotic domination upon your part, and of provincial turbulence upon ours; and while on spurious religion and spurious notoriety, I pronounce my denunciation, live, let me be permitted to add, the spirit of genuine philanthropic forbearing and forgiving Christianity amongst us; and, combined with it, live the exalted patriotism, which to the welfare of a great people, and the glory of this majestic empire, of all its wishes makes the dedication, which, superior to the wretched passions, that ought to be short-lived as the passing incidents of which they were born, acts in conformity with the imperial policy of WILLIAM PITT, and the results of the vast invention of JAMES WATT, sees the legislation of the

one ratified by the science of the other, in the discovery of the mighty mechanist, who made the Irish Channel like the Tweed of the project, of which the son of CHATHAM beholds the consummation."

The third reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of SIXTY-ONE. We now follow it into the House of Lords, where the dissecting knife of Lord LYN DHURST was to be applied to it—where, in fact, the whole of its provisions were to be uprooted, and an entirely new Bill substituted. On Monday, the 18th April, it was read a second time in the Lords, after a long and able speech from Lord LYN DHURST, in which he stated, fully, his views, and gave notice of his intention to carry them out in the shape of an instruction to the Committee. We hear no more of the Bill until the 9th of May, when Lord LYN DHURST introduced over one hundred clauses, to be substituted for the Government measure. The principles, on which these clauses were framed were, firstly, abolition of the Corporations; secondly, compensation to existing officials; thirdly, the preservation of Charitable Trusts, and a provision for the local administration of justice. The whole of these clauses were adopted in one sitting of the House. It was on this occasion, that Lord LYN DHURST made his celebrated Alien speech, for which he, afterwards, when conciliation was his policy, expressed his bitter repentance. It was on this occasion he said the Irish people were " Aliens in blood, in religion, and in language," from the Protestant Proprietary. When these clauses came down, in the month of June, to be considered by the House of Commons, Lord JOHN RUSSELL moved, that twelve of the large towns, where Corporations were abolished by the Lords, should have the benefit of Corporate Reform and Municipal Government by Town Councils, while he consented to the abolition of the smaller towns. It was

then that the Noble Lord made use of the expressions; which have been since so often quoted:—

“ Be assured of this, that the first cannon ball, which is fired in Europe, will be the signal of your retracting all these denials, and of your making that concession, and doing that justice, in the hour of your need, which you refused in the hey-day of your glory and your strength.”

On this occasion SHIEL, again, distinguished himself. PEEL, too, made a speech of much force and ingenuity. He concluded it in these words:—

“ Sir, I do not dissent from the Ministerial measure, from any such feelings of national prejudice or national hostility as have been suggested as likely to influence me in this opposition; but on the grounds that, instead of promoting civil equality amongst the people of Ireland, it would divide and distract them by promoting a new political ascendancy—that, instead of repose, it would inflict agitation—that, instead of destroying the monopoly of power, it would recreate and establish it—and in the present state of Ireland, it would only have the effect of transferring that power, from a body that is willing to resign to another that is but too willing to grasp and wield it for its exclusive advantage.”

He was ably replied to by Mr. O'CONNELL, who, having been lately, on the report of the Election Committee on the Dublin petition, unseated from the Representation of that city, now appeared in Parliament as Member for Kilkenny. Lord STANLEY followed—and on a division, Lord JOHN RUSSELL's proposition, agreeing to some of the Lords' amendments, and rejecting others, was carried by a majority of EIGHTY-SIX. This majority was so large, that it was not believed the Upper House would offer any further resistance, and the people were confident of, at length, seeing, in Ireland, the old misan-

was abolished, and a healthy system of local Government instituted. Reasons were drawn up by the Commons for disagreeing in the amendments of the Lords. A conference took place. This is a mere formality,—a few members of each House meet in a committee, and bowing to one another, the Commons hand in their written reasons for dissenting from the Lords and retire. The amendments of the Commons were taken into consideration on the twenty-seventh of June, and a most remarkable debate arose. Lord LYNDBURST'S speech was, undeniably, a great effort. He seemed excited by the attacks made on him, both in the House of Commons, and in Ireland. He particularly referred to Mr. SHIEL, Mr. O'CONNELL, and Lord JOHN RUSSELL, as his three principal assailants. Speaking of SHIEL, he says:—

“ I bear no enmity to that honourable gentleman—he was labouring in his vocation. If I had borne any enmity towards him at any time, it would have been effectually removed by the great pleasure I have derived, over and over again, from his light and brilliant eloquence; above all, by the great amusement he has lately afforded me by his felicity of expression, and by the extraordinary drollery with which the whole scene was accomplished.”

Then referring to O'CONNELL:—

“ The next was a man of different stamp; for nothing can be more strongly contrasted than the well-tempered weapon of the gentleman to whom I have referred, and the coarse rusty plane of his associate. I have not much power of description: I wished I possessed the power enjoyed in so eminent a degree by the Noble Viscount.—I shall never forget—your Lordships will never forget—the sketch which on a former night the Noble Viscount drew of this person; how an air of mystery surrounded him; and how he appeared visiting our planet, once in the

revolution of a century, the multitude gazing at him, doubtful as to his character, doubtful whether his nature was benevolent or malignant ; doubtful whether he was

' a spirit of health, or goblin damned !'

The noble viscount, pursuing the quotation, seemed almost to say

' He call the King,
' Father' —

' I say, my Lords, that I possess none of these powers of description ; but even, if I did, they would be unnecessary on this occasion. This person has so changed himself in the eyes of the multitude, has exhibited himself in such a variety of postures, (not always the most seemly, or decent, but which have gained him their shouts and applause,) that any description on my part is rendered useless. My Lords, for these feats he has received lavish contributions, lordly, may I say ducal contributions, from supporters and connexions of the present Government, while, at the same time, he has wrung, by the aid of the priests, their miserable pittance from the hands of the starving peasants. This person has, in every shape and form, insulted your Lordships, your Lordship's house, and many of you individually. He has denounced and devoted you to destruction. Availing himself of your courtesy, he comes to your Lordship's bar, he listens to your proceedings, he ranks, and measures ye for his victims. *'Etiam in senatum venit, fit publici consilii particeps : notat et designat oculis ad cædem unumquemque nostrum.'* The man, my Lords, to whom these expressions were applied, had at least one redeeming quality. Witness the last scene of his life, when mindful of his former elevation and dignity, he is so ably, so poetically, and so beautifully described by the Roman Historian. My Lords, where was this accusation against me made, and under what circumstan-

ces? It was made at a meeting of the inhabitants of Middlesex, where this lawyer, this friend of free institutions, this declaimer, this eternal declaimer, for justice, for the edification of his audience, suited his coarse and scurrilous jests at the murder of a Monarch, and at the same time, almost in the same breath, insulted, by his jeers, the successor of that Monarch—our present most gracious sovereign. (Cheers.) Such, my Lords, is the man who has assailed me. Such are the circumstances under which he has done so.”

Such was the bitterness and venom with which the Irish leader was attacked in 1836. Lord GREY on this occasion re-appeared from his retirement, for the purpose of aiding in carrying this measure, and he gave an additional interest to the debate. An eye-witness has thus recorded the sensation he produced when he rose:—

“ When he rose to address the house, and, quitting the front cross-bench, where he had taken his seat early in the evening, went over to the Ministerial Bench, near to Lord MELBOURNE, there was a buz of welcome and applause, as if one had come who had often delighted and instructed, and to whose eloquence, even if it were only once more, there was a strong anxiety to listen pervading the entire assembly. He commenced, and was not speaking three or four minutes when, it was satisfactorily evident that his voice, at all events, had suffered no decay, and as he proceeded, the pleasure was increased, when it was found that the mental powers were as strong as ever, and that in every respect he retained that vigor of mind and understanding, which gave him a place and estimation above most men of his day. But even against *his* advice, remonstrance and persuasion, faction was proof, and the determination come to on the previous Saturday at Apsley House—to persist in the

insult to the Commons and the People of Ireland—was acted on, in disdainful disregard of the recorded opinions of the one, and the just and natural feelings of the other.”

The chief amendments of the Commons were rejected by a majority of NINETY-SEVEN, and reasons were drawn, and a conference demanded with the lower house. These new amendments of the Lords were brought before the House of Commons by Lord JOHN RUSSELL. In his speech, he replied ably to Lord LYNTHURST, and concluded by moving, amidst enthusiastic cheers, that the amendments should be taken into consideration in three months. O'CONNELL did not take any notice of Lord LYNTHURST's attack. Avoiding personalities, he directed himself to the question at issue—namely, the fearful struggle which the Lords were encouraging between the two countries. He closed his speech in these words:—

“Is there really any one so insane as to suppose that this can last for ever? Having succeeded, by dint of peaceable agitation, in obtaining one portion of Catholic Emancipation from your hand—yes, a portion, for after all, that act was but a part of the justice we looked for—having forced that part from the right hon. baronet and from the noble duke, who in 1828 talked about conquering Ireland with the sword, and in 1829, found it more agreeable to put it in the scabbard—I tell you that the people of Ireland defy your menaces for the future. Neither the noble Duke, nor your minority shall ever be permitted to trample upon Ireland with impunity. In the name of the Irish people, I give you this defiance. Do not think that I mock when I talk to you. I tell you that if you refuse to do justice to us, we are able to do justice to ourselves. I have given up the agitation of the question of the Repeal of the Union, and now see what an argument you have given me

in support of it. See the large majority in the House of Lords, and the minority in the House of Commons; both denying justice to Ireland; and the leader of the opposition party, absolutely identifying himself with the majority in the Lords—that leader himself having made a brief and vain attempt at government last year, with no-Popery flag floating over his head. I know there are men who, because they see a person obey the mandate of what he fancies to be a superior authority, charge him with the want of personal, though I defy them to deny him moral, courage. Let them try this experiment a little longer, and I tell them, that there is not one man in Ireland, with the small exception I have somewhere else alluded to, who would not die ten thousand deaths rather than submit to the insult which is now attempted to be put upon them. I know the present government are disposed to do all they possibly can, in order to obtain justice for the people of Ireland. Let my support of them be misrepresented as it may, I shall support them, because I know that there is no alternative between a system of uncompromising despotism in Ireland, and the maintenance in power of the present ministry. I repeat that there is not a man in Ireland who can read, and we are more fortunate in this respect than you are, but will read the account of these proceedings, and instantly demand of the Parliament to wipe away the insult which it has put upon him. The moral courage of a whole people will unite, and peaceably, quietly, but irresistibly demand one of these two things—the Repeal of the Union, or justice to Ireland from the British Parliament. For my own part, I shall continue the experiment I have entered upon, of obtaining justice for Ireland without a repeal. I shall persevere in that experiment as long as it seems to be compatible with justice to my country; and no man would pardon me if I were to go further. This

is my determination. In the meantime, you have heaped insult upon injury; the iron has entered into our very souls, but you will find that we are no resistless victims, and that you may not long continue this career with impunity."

There was, for the year 1836, an end of the Irish Municipal Bill. Such was the result of this remarkable struggle between both Houses. Never before did the House of Lords show such determination; never before were the Commons more resolute. It was very easy to foresee at which side victory would ultimately declare itself. It was idle to think, that, in outraging a principle involving such great popular rights, the people of England would sustain the House of Lords. Scotland had quietly obtained Municipal Reform, more than three years before. That measure was brought in first in the House of Lords, and passed both Houses without any opposition, and with scarcely a remark. There was a show of resistance to the English Bill, and it was, in many important particulars, materially injured by the Lords' Amendments. But it became law the same session it was introduced. Not so was their conduct towards Ireland. Plainly, and without disguise, they refused an equal measure of Justice to that country, because it would tend to increase O'CONNELL'S influence. The Irish majority were "aliens in language, in blood, and in religion," from the English minority who were the proprietary of the soil—they were unfitted for self-government—they were the mere unenlightened followers of England's arch-enemy—Municipal Government could not be accorded to such a nation. It is true, that the Corporations from whom, in the olden day, they received so much support, and whom they before so gratefully sustained, they now abandoned—they admitted their exclusiveness—their monopoly—their selfishness, and their

intolerance; and said they should be abated as nuisances. Even the Dublin Corporation, that, in its time, had done Sir ROBERT PEEL so much service—that addressed him, and cheered him when he quarrelled with O'CONNELL—had voted him a piece of plate, for which they allowed him to pay—even that Corporation was to be placed in Schedule A, and to be abolished. So long as they could uphold them they did; but the moment they found that the Whigs, with unceasing vigour, had broken down their entrenchments, and that under their command, the Catholics of Ireland were about to enter, then they proposed, as was done at Moscow, that the strongholds should be broken down, and, by destroying all, leave no resting place to the invaders. Irishmen were to be deprived of self-government—the system of centralization, and of government control was to be encouraged, sooner than allow a Catholic to participate in the blessings of free and popular institutions. Far, far better would it have been to have allowed the old system to continue, and depend upon the advance of enlightenment, and of education, to induce the local authorities to abandon the monopoly they still retained, but which they were gradually giving up, than to permit the principle of self-government to be abandoned. This proposition of abolition came with a bad grace from PEEL, who obtained for us Emancipation. Hitherto that measure was a mere shadow. It conferred scarcely a practical right. The Corporations never recognised the act on which PEEL founded his fame. The proposition of abolition came too, with a bad grace, from one who, in after years, when Premier, called upon his Lord Lieutenant, to carry out, practically, the Emancipation Act, by giving a preference to Catholics in all legal appointments. But the spirit of party was then strong, and, therefore, was it, that he made Irish antipathies the

chevalle de bataille, on which he hoped to make Conservatism triumph. Thus was Ireland, in 1836, sacrificed to the Moloch of party—in the same manner as she has ever been. This policy was, however, but affording fresh stimulants to that renewed agitation, which is destined to give, if followed up with perseverance, not only local, but national self-government to Ireland.

The Lords reckoned without their host, when they supposed that the English constituencies would sanction this piece of injustice. From all quarters, O'CONNELL was receiving testimonials of sympathy. Invitations to public dinners were pouring in on him. On the 4th of April, we find him at Nottingham. He was there as enthusiastically received as if it were his own fatherland, and, though every effort was made by the Tories to create a prejudice against him, by placarding, what he was reported to have said of the women of England, still, his reception was most flattering. In fact, there was a triumphal procession formed to receive, and accompany him into the town. The LIBERATOR did not allow the Tory placard to pass without notice, and, when addressing the vast multitude, he thus referred to it:—

“ Instead of making a speech, I have a question to ask you—I want to know if there is one Tory there? I am sorry there is not, for I have an account to settle with them. There was only one calumny ever uttered against me, that I have thought it worth my while to deny. It is so base a calumny, that I scarcely find it possible to pronounce it from my lips. They dare to assert that I was degraded enough to traduce the maids and matrons of England. It is the only calumny I ever designed to answer; and my answer to it is, that is a lie. It is the worst kind of lie, too, because it is a wanton assault upon character. I remember the time when knowledge was so little diffused, and the reign of ignorance was so pre-

valent, that when a Turk made his appearance in London, he was hated by the people, who called him all manner of nick names, until at length some one of them, exceedingly spiteful, in order to amalgamate national prejudices, christened him a French Turk. I want to mark this lie in somewhat of a similar way, and will therefore designate it as a lie—the worst sort of a lie—a *Tory lie*. And they know it to be such, for when upon a former occasion, I addressed countless thousands in Birmingham as here, I repudiated the same imputation in precisely similar terms. The same thing was asserted in the Tory newspapers, and I contradicted it; but, like true Tories, they still continued to assert it. I, therefore, set all the slanderous crew at defiance. Let any man say when and where I ever said such a thing. But they are too cunning for that. The moment they attempt to give a date, the falsehood of the imputation will be made manifest. So I have done with my refutation of this egregious calumny.”

Justice for Ireland was the theme on which he discoursed at the Nottingham Banquet. So, likewise, was it his text at York, at Ipswich, at Bungay, at Rochester, in all which cities he was enthusiastically received. Mrs. O'CONNELL, though in declining health, accompanied him on this tour, and the ladies of Nottingham presented her with—“a lace veil of the most superb character the manufacture of that town can produce, as a testimony of their estimation of her husband's services in the cause of Ireland, and of admiration of the domestic support and zealous encouragement, which she has always given him in his political career, especially in periods of the greatest trial, difficulty, and discouragement.”

Mr. O'CONNELL did not confine his exertions exclusively to Irish interests. We find him attacking every abuse, and every monopoly, we find him advocating in 1836, the abolition of Corporal punishment in the Army;

a principle, which, in a great degree has since been, in 1847, adopted by the Duke of WELLINGTON. We find him urging the abolition of all taxes upon knowledge, and advocating, warmly, the cause of suffering Poland. Wherever a social reform was to be achieved, or political liberty advanced, there was O'CONNELL, ever ready to enter into the struggle.

In England, particularly in London, there was considerable anxiety evinced for the success of the Irish Municipal Act. There were meetings, in various places, without O'CONNELL'S presence, and when he did appear, the enthusiasm was very great. There were meetings at Finsbury, and one in the County of Middlesex—both held on the same day, and both of which he attended. The latter is made remarkable by his attack on Lord LYNDHURST, to which his Lordship replied in the language we have already quoted. Every exertion was made by him to induce the English to join him in the demand for justice. Not content with making speeches, he addressed long letters, written in his usual forcible and telling style, to the Reformers in England. Nothing was left undone to create a sympathy for the wrongs inflicted on his country. In Ireland, too, in consequence of the hostility of the Lords, the excitement was unprecedented, at least, since 1828. There were large assemblages of the people in different Counties—Kildare, Clare, Tipperary, Louth, Longford, Tyrone, Queen's County, King's County, Monaghan, &c. At the Meath meeting, Sir WILLIAM SOMERVILLE declared that he would join the Repealers, if the Lords continued to refuse Justice to Ireland. A new Reform Association was established in Dublin, and while O'CONNELL was agitating in England, Mr. SHIEL was exerting his unequalled eloquence, in Ireland, to rouse the nation to

a proper sense of the insults, as well as the injustice it endured. It had all the appearance of a political crisis, but it passed off like a dark but fleeting cloud. It was but a transitory exhibition of feeling, at the denial of equal justice, after the pledges, which were registered by both Houses of Parliament. It was then evident, that the only question, in support of which the people could be really interested, was the Repeal of the Union. That question had been put in abeyance—their spirits were damped on account of this, and no ordinary question of policy was capable of arousing them. Any excitement, which was exhibited in 1836, was momentary, and soon passed away. In fact, none, but those who mingled with them can know how deep was the disappointment of the people, at the adjournment of the great question, for the success of which they felt an intense anxiety, and for which alone they had any inclination—the question of Repeal. O'CONNELL, while in England, aided, by letters addressed to the people of Ireland, and to the National Association, the agitation for Justice—and, like every act of his, it had its effect amongst the middle classes, but the people had but one all-absorbing interest—the attainment of Repeal, and, until he again opened that bright prospect to their view, it was difficult to urge them into exertion.

The new tithe bill was, on the 25th of April, introduced by Lord MORPETH. In it, the appropriation clause was retained. Tithes were to be commuted for a rent-charge, with a deduction of $32\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The portion of the million loan, which was advanced, was to be forgiven. The surplus, after allowing a fair income to the clergy for the duty discharged, was to be devoted to the education of the whole people, without distinction of creed—no living was to exceed five hundred a year, or to be

less than one hundred. The introduction of this bill was not opposed by Sir ROBERT PEEL, though every successive year the terms offered to the clergy were less than those of preceding one. In June, the debate in the Commons, on the second reading, came off—STANLEY, O'CONNELL, Sir JAMES GRAHAM, and PEEL were the chief speakers. O'CONNELL spoke in a bold, defiant tone. When he appealed to the opposition, not to sanction, by their partiality to the measure, the spilling of blood—his appeal was received with groans—he then called them “men of blood,”—He was called to order—he retracted the expression in reference to members of the House, but repeated, that, outside the House, were his appeal to their humanity so received by any class of men, he would call them “men of blood.” He concluded a most masterly oration in the following words:—

“I call on you now to do it, if you be statesmen and not empyrics; if you be Christians with a Christian charity in your bosoms, and not mere sectarians and pretenders to religion; if you believe in that retribution with which honest men ever visit those who have been guided in their actions by mere trick or party spirit—or if, above all, you believe in that more awful retribution which shall be visited upon you by that omnipotent being who must some day hence judge the motives, and the secret intentions of us all.”

Sir ROBERT PEEL, in reply, concluded the debate, and the Bill was read, a second time, by a majority of THIRTY-NINE.

The two plans of Church Reform proposed, one by Lord MORPETH, and the other by Lord STANLEY, may be here put in juxtaposition, in order that their relative values may be better estimated. After appropriating £50,000 a year to the purposes of general education, the Government measure proposed to assign—

“ To 675 benefices of the first class, containing more than 50, and less than 500 Protestants, at £200, per benefice, rent charge, and 30 acres of glebe, value at 30s per acre—£165,376.

“ To 211 benefices of the second class, containing more than 500, and less than 1000 Protestants, at £300 per benefice, rent charge, and 30 acres of glebe, valued as before, £72,795.

“ To 190 benefices of the third class, containing more than 1,000 and less than 3,000 Protestants, at £400 per benefice, rent charge, and 30 acres of glebe, valued as before—£84,550.

“ To 51 benefices of fourth class, containing upwards of 3,000 Protestants, at £500 per benefice, rent charge, and 30 acres of glebe, valued as before.—£27,795.

“ To 123 benefices of the fifth class, containing less than 50 Protestants, at £100 per benefice, rent charge, and 30 acres of glebe, valued as before—£17,855.”

Lord STANLEY'S project, on the other hand, was:—
 “That the ecclesiastical commissioners be directed to report forthwith, respecting the state of benefices in cities and towns, and as soon as possible afterwards, upon the state of rural benefices. In regard to the latter class of benefices, where the income was £500, or the congregation less than 100, whatever the income, the Commissioners might recommend the junction of benefices. In the same class of livings, the Commissioners might recommend reduction of the income, but not to a lower amount than £300. The amount arising from these reductions he proposed to devote, in the first instance, to the building of glebe-houses; in the next, to the building or repair of churches, as necessity might require; and the remainder to the augmentation of small livings. He

proposed to prohibit the augmentation of small livings to more than £300, where such livings were not situated in a town. In town parishes, he proposed that the augmentation should be carried as high as £400 or £500."

On the 4th of July, the Irish Church Bill went into committee, and in the progress of the debate, on Lord MAHON'S amendment, that Church property should be inalienable, a most uproarious scene occurred. Lord STANLEY had charged O'CONNELL with advising the people of Ireland, for his own advantages, to their detriment. O'CONNELL immediately said—"That's untrue." This excited Lord STANLEY'S bile, and the two antagonists got into immediate conflict.

Lord STANLEY said—"The hon. and learned gentleman will allow me to say, he is the last man who ought to make use, in this house, or elsewhere, of offensive expressions such as that which he has just used—most indecently interrupting me."

Mr. O'CONNELL was immediately on his legs. He said—"I rise to order. Have I not a right to express my feelings when a charge is untruly made against me? In the first place, the noble lord garbles my letter. I repeat it. I repeat it distinctly that the noble lord, in the first place, read garbled extracts from my letter. In the next place, the noble lord said that the people of Ireland had often followed my advice to their detriment. When such assertions, so foreign from the fact, are made, I conceive that I have a right to reply to them. If such a mode of argument is unworthy of any man, it is still less becoming in the noble lord, whom I have observed shrink from every man in the house but me."

The scene which followed was indescribable. The debate was suspended for nearly an hour, a dozen members at a time endeavouring to interfere. At last it was resumed, Lord STANLEY continuing his statement. He

was replied to by O'CONNELL. Lord JOHN RUSSELL closed the debate, in a speech of more than usual animation and point, for the scene in which he took a part excited him ; and when excited, there was not in Parliament a more eloquent man. The appropriation clause was carried by a majority of TWENTY-SIX. We may—that principle being affirmed in the Commons—follow the Bill into the House of Lords. Accordingly, we there find Lord LYNDHURST doing what Lord STANLEY could not effect in the Lower House, and on the 25th of July, the appropriation clause was expunged. Several other amendments were made. Shorn of the appropriation clause, the bill came down to the Commons, and there Lord JOHN RUSSELL moved that it should be taken into consideration that day three months. Nothing could be more eloquent, animated and masterly, than the noble Lord's speech. He was replied to by Sir ROBERT PEEL. But the most brilliant speech of the entire Session, indeed the most exquisite specimen of oratory that ever came from SHIEL's lips, was his speech in this debate. Every line of it would be read, and read again, with delight.— But we can scarcely afford space for the brilliant oration.

“ If, ” he says, “ we were seven millions of mere un-intellectual, dull, insensible, degraded serfs, a mere mass of helotism, to our 7,000,000 little regard should be paid. Once we were sunk indeed by the penal code, but a marvellous change has taken place. Men often talk of the great improvement which has taken place in Ireland, and, in doing so, they refer merely to its external aspect ; its moral one has undergone a still greater alteration.— Not only has the plough climbed to the top of the mountain, and cultivation pierced the morass, but the mind of Ireland has been reclaimed. You educate our people,

and with the education of the people, the continuance of unnatural and unjust institutions is incompatible. But, if education has done much, agitation has done more.— Although it may have been attended with many evils, it has been accompanied by one great countervailing good. Public opinion, which before did not exist, has been created in Ireland. The minds of men of all classes have been inlaid with the great principles on which the rights of the majority depended. The salutary influence has ascended to the higher classes, spread among the middle, and descended among the lower.—The humblest peasant has been nobly affected by it. Even in the midst of the most abject destitution, he has begun to acquire a sentiment of self-respect:—‘ He venerates himself a man.’ I remember the time when, if you struck an Irish peasant, he cowered beneath the blow. Strike him now—the spirit of offended manhood starts up in a breast covered with rags. His Celtic blood boils up as yours would, and he feels and he acts as if he were born in this noble land of yours, where the person of every British citizen is sacred from affront, and from his birth he had breathed that moral atmosphere which Britons are accustomed to inhale. No, Sir, we are not what we were. We have caught the intonations of your rhymes; Englishmen, we are too like you, to give you leave to keep us down; nay, in some points, we have surpassed you. Have you read the evidence of the intimidation committee, and the dispraise of heroism in rags which it details? The Irish peasant is prepared again to do what he did before, and to bid defiance, in the cause of his country, to poverty, expulsion, and ruin. Do you doubt it? Put it to the test. If parliament were dissolved to-morrow our numbers would be augmented, and even if they were to remain stationary, no Conservative government could long withstand the pressure of sixty repre-

sentatives, not of a transitory faction, but of an undecaying and imperishable people. If we stood alone, I should not despair. Sustained by British sympathy, how can I, for a moment, of the triumph of this great cause, entertain a doubt? Scotland is with us. The Scotch feel that the cause in which their fathers bled is ours; and as to England, if we have been defeated in skirmishes at occasional elections, I make no question that at a general election, in the great onset, we should win the day; and if we do (and with that question I conclude) what course will the Tories take? They bid us yield to the Lords. Will they, in that event, yield to the people? Will they give up the great principle on which their resistance is founded? The member for Lancashire will cry out, that he will resist it to the death;—the member for Tamworth, will he resist it also?"

Lord JOHN RUSSELL'S motion was carried, and thus ended the second great party struggle of the Session. Thus was the obstructive policy again, for a season, successful.

O'CONNELL, not content with his exertions in Parliament on this Church question, addressed two letters—"to the People of England." In the last letter, which was remarkable for its clearness of diction, and for the information which, for the first time, was afforded the English People on the state of the Irish Church, he laid before them the Review of the Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, and demonstrated the utter folly of maintaining the tremendous Church Establishment in Ireland. On this question he practised more than he preached, for by refusing, as Mr. SHIEL did, to pay his tithes, he was on the point of being outlawed by the Court of Exchequer, and we find the Dublin Conservative organs of the day, seriously discussing whe-

ther—being an outlaw, it was not lawful to shoot him, “as you would a Tom-tit.”

We have already observed that during the discussions of the Irish Municipal Act, O'CONNELL was unseated from the representation of Dublin. The scrutiny in Dublin, before the Commissioners, had consumed several months, and reduced his majority to almost to an unit.—The investigation was then taken up by the election committee and occupied six weeks. The expectation was when the amount of bribery given on the Conservative side, and the intimidation exercised, was ascertained, that though O'CONNELL's majority was, at last, changed to a minority—still there would be a new election. But the Committee decided otherwise, and Messrs. WEST and HAMILTON, the defeated candidates at the election, were declared the sitting members. However, O'CONNELL was not twenty-four hours without a seat in Parliament. He was unseated as member for Dublin on Monday, the 16th May, and the next day, in Kilkenny, within ten minutes after the Court opened, he was declared the representative for that patriotic town, the late member, RICHARD SULLIVAN, Esq., having previously accepted the Chiltern Hundreds, for the purpose of securing an immediate seat for him. At twelve o'clock on Tuesday, the 17th May, Mr. KENNY PURCELL started express for London with the return, with the view of enabling O'CONNELL to be in his place, on Thursday evening, when the discussion on the Lords' Amendment of the Irish Municipal bill came on for discussion. The feat was accomplished. Such was the intense anxiety, then in Ireland, not to lose the LIBERATOR's services even for a day—such was the patriotic ardour and self-devotion which he inspired. Defending his seat cost him an enormous sum of money. Indeed, the election expenses he then incurred, including those for his son's, involved him in pe-

cuniary engagements, which, but for the generosity and gratitude of the people, he would have found it difficult to meet. But they felt that he was fighting their battle, and therefore was it, that in a spirit of justice they nobly sustained him. In England too, the Reformers raised a fund, as a testimonial of their gratitude for O'CONNELL'S exertions, and to assist him in liquidating the enormous expense to which he was made subject.—Some of the leading men in England took up with spirit the collection for the testimonial. It was, however, to a certain extent, a failure. The whole amount he received after deducting expenses, was £8,489; though, at the first meeting held, over three thousand pounds were subscribed. At this meeting, Mr. HUME presided. Mr. WARBURTON proposed the first resolution :—

“ That this Meeting, taking into consideration the services of D. O'CONNELL, Esq., as the able, persevering, and intrepid advocate of the rights of Ireland, and the steady supporter of Reform in Great Britain, is of opinion, that the time has arrived when the British people should come forward to support him against the unexampled persecution which he has suffered from the enemies of good Government, especially with reference to the late Election proceedings against him; and that immediate measures should be adopted to raise a fund to defray the expenses to which Mr. O'CONNELL has been subjected, and to mark the respect and gratitude of the people of this country for his services.”

Mr. MARSHALL, M. P., proposed the second—namely
 “That a general subscription be forthwith entered into, to carry into effect the foregoing resolution, and that the Reformers in every part of the British empire, particularly those in the reformed Municipal Corporations, be invited to co-operate with this meeting in promoting this most desirable object.”

A Committee of twenty-five was then appointed to carry out the objects of the meeting. But it would seem that the organization, to give them effect, was insufficient—otherwise a much larger sum would have been obtained. Indeed, at the time, it was confidently stated that over thirty thousand pounds would be readily subscribed.

The following letter, from Mr. HUME, will give the reader an accurate idea of the motives which suggested the subscription, and the object for which it was undertaken.

“Salopian Coffee-house, London, July 22, 1836.

“MY LORD—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, enclosing £20, for the O’CONNELL Subscription. The Committee, who have stood forward to promote the cause of civil and religious liberty, by manifesting to the Orangemen of Ireland and England that there are Englishmen who appreciate the long and persevering exertions of Mr. O’CONNELL, and are prepared to support him against their persecution, are pleased to receive your Lordship’s approbation of their humble efforts in that cause.

“The present peace and satisfaction existing in Ireland, are proofs of a better system already begun in that country, and may be fairly considered as the results of Mr. O’CONNELL’s judicious and patriotic agitation on behalf of his oppressed and suffering countrymen, and should prove, to the House of Lords, what the force of moral confidence in the wise and liberal government of Earl MULGRAVE can effect, although they have denied equal laws and equal justice to that country.

“We must admit that the efforts of Mr. O’CONNELL have been made in more favourable times than when GRATAN and NEWPORT laboured for their country’s rights. But, as no efforts in a good cause are thrown away, their zealous and strenuous efforts all contribute to the success which have crowned Mr. O’CONNELL’S labours.

“ The expense incurred by Mr. O'CONNELL, in defending his own and his son's seat in Parliament, exceeded £12,500, and the meeting at the Crown and Anchor, on the 1st of June, have not been disappointed in appealing to the good feelings of the Reformers of England, for the means of discharging that heavy expense.

“ Already the Committee have received between £7,000 and £8,000 towards their object, and it must be worm-wood and gall to the Tories to know that no member of his Majesty's Whig Government has contributed one shilling towards that amount; and it is to be hoped, that they will now admit, that, if the MELBOURNE Administration has been, as it is, supported by the colossal power of Mr. O'CONNELL—that Mr. O'CONNELL has not received any support, from that Administration, on this occasion.

“ I trust that every contributor, towards the object the committee have undertaken, will find that Mr. O'CONNELL's labours will be continued in promoting good government in Ireland, whether a Tory or a Whig Administration may exist, and that every Englishman will also benefit by his exertions.

“ I have the honour, &c.,

(Signed) “ JOSEPH HUME.

“ The Earl of SUFFOLK.”

Amongst the other Noblemen, who responded to the application made to them, was the Duke of BEDFORD. He, subscribed one hundred guineas. When this fact was made known to WILLIAM THE FOURTH, the King showed his feelings of indignation, by ordering the bust of the Duke which stood in the gallery at Windsor, to be taken and removed; at the same time observing, that although every man was perfectly right to stand by his party if he chose it, HE would not allow the bust of any Nobleman to remain at the Castle, who should subscribe to the O'CONNELL tribute.

This incident, of which there is no doubt, shows the bitter hostility the KING entertained towards O'CONNELL.

We have seen the efforts that were made, during the year 1835-36, to damage the Whig Government, by reason of the support they obtained from O'CONNELL. We have seen how independent that support was—we have seen how the attempt made, utterly, and entirely failed. Another occasion was, in June, 1836, taken to tarnish the reputation, in another way, of Lord MELBOURNE, and thus get rid of him and his Government. The Hon. Mr. NORTON, brother to Lord GRANTLEY, brought an action against Lord MELBOURNE, for criminal conversation with his noble and highly gifted wife. As the result proved, there never was so baseless a charge. We don't deny that the husband, Mr. NORTON, may have entertained suspicions. But these were created in his mind by the whisperings of others—they were exaggerated by his own temper, and indulged in to excuse his previous conduct to an amiable wife and most attached mother.—Without cause, her children were taken from her, long before this affair was even thought of.—Mrs. NORTON was obliged to leave him on account of his treatment of her, arising from incongeniality of disposition. For a time she was allowed to see her children. At last they were removed from London, and given in charge of a near relative of her husband, who, Mrs. NORTON knew, disliked her intensely. All this combined to induce her at all hazards to return to her husband, contrary to the advice and wish of her friends. It was during this time that Lord MELBOURNE, as an old friend of her father's—and being himself fond of the relaxation of literary friends, was in the habit of visiting Mrs. NORTON, at her husband's residence near Storey's Gate—not far from the Premier's official residence in Downing

Street. As Mr. NORTON was a Police Magistrate, these visits, of necessity, took place during his sittings on the Magisterial Bench. Party spirit, inflamed by private hate, suggested unworthy suspicions against a virtuous wife. The action was instituted. While pending, Lord MELBOURNE'S Government was familiarly called the "Crim-Connell Administration." It was evident, if there was a verdict against him, the Ministry would have been broken up. The sufferings of the poor wife were forgotten, in the intense political excitement which the trial caused. The Attorney General, now Lord CAMPBELL, immortalized himself by his noble advocacy of his client's cause. There was an immediate verdict returned for Lord MELBOURNE, and the Whig Government was again on its legs. Thus were painful family differences made to aid political intrigues. Thus have they, of necessity, become a portion of history. Failing to injure the Ministry, by wounding the reputation of O'CONNELL,—failing to break up the Government by blackening the character of an accomplished lady, the next effort made was to increase the prejudices of the English nation against the national religion of Ireland, and thus indirectly, through O'CONNELL—effect what direct attacks on the Irish leader could not accomplish. We have already seen how anxiously the Protestant Association circulated portions of the writings of PETER DENS, in order to shock the feelings of the Protestant community—and how they attached to Catholic doctrines some of the exploded teachings of that writer—though some of the Bishops of the Catholic Church publicly denied that his writings on theology were of authority on the subject. However, some passages in his works, and some notes of the Romish Douay Testament, justifying the most ultra doctrines against heresy, and published, without distinct authority, by a Cork Bookseller, in 1817, were too good for their

purposes to be allowed to remain in obscurity. Accordingly, publicity being the object, it was considered, if the great DAN could be induced to enter the Lion's den—a sure triumph of Evangelism would be effected. With that view, the following correspondence was commenced by the London Protestant Association.

“ TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ., M.P.

“ Protestant Association, 2, Exeter-hall,

“ June 25, 1837.

“ SIR—The committee of the Protestant Association have received, from the Rev. ROBERT M'GHEE, a letter, of which a copy is enclosed, which they are requested by Mr. M'GHEE to forward to you. In so doing, the committee desire to add, that they join with Mr. M'GHEE in the intimation therein contained, and will wait till Thursday, the 30th instant, for any reply which you may be pleased to send, before they proceed to make arrangement for the intended meeting. We remain, &c.

“ (Signed by the Secretaries.)”

“THE REV. ROBERT M'GHEE TO D. O'CONNELL, ESQ., M.P.

“ Enniskerry, Monday, June 20, 1836.

“ Justice for Ireland and truth for England.

“SIR—Having been requested by the Protestant Association in London, to attend a meeting to be held in Exeter Hall, on Tuesday, July 12, it is my intention, if it pleases Divine Providence to allow me, to submit to the meeting resolutions containing some additional facts as to “DEN's Theology,” which have not been laid before the public, and which prove the unanimous and continued adoption of that standard of theology by your Bishops; and also establishing the fact that your Bishops have patronised, and propagated among the people, the intolerant and persecuting notes of the Rhemish Testament.

“ The abjuration of these notes, by Dr. TROY, in 1817, your own professed rejection of them, and your proceedings at the Catholic Board—your appointment of a committee, and the result of the case, are all so well known to you that I shall not anticipate the statements of the platform by entering upon them now, but I shall call on you, please Divine Providence, to explain the facts to the English nation ! and, for this purpose, I invite you, thus publicly, to come and apply all your legal talents to invalidate the documents and facts, on which I shall found the resolutions I shall propose to the meeting.

“ To preclude all possible charge of slander, misrepresentation, or any other of the imputations which have been cast upon me, I propose, that the arrangements for the meeting be made by a committee of members of the House of Commons, whereof half should be chosen by yourself, and half by the Protestant Association ; that the tickets for the meeting be equally divided, and that it be clearly understood that the statements on both sides shall be heard in perfect silence.

“ I have the honour to be, &c.”

“ MR. O'CONNELL TO ONE OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE
PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION.

“ 10, Langham-place, June 29, 1836.”

“ REV. SIR—I have reason to complain, I really think I have, that you should transmit to me any document emanating from the person who styles himself the Rev. ROBERT M'GHEE. After that unhappy person's exhibitions in public, and especially after his indescribable conduct to that meek and venerable prelate, Dr. MURRAY, I do submit to your own good sense and good feeling, that you ought not to inflict any letter of his upon any fellow-Christian.

“I therefore return you his letter without intending you any disrespect. Upon reflection you will, I should hope, agree with me, that this is the only course which a rational man could take with such a letter, particularly as the writer is so careless of all the observances of life, as to omit the ordinary courtesies between man and man ; but, let me add, that I freely forgive the want of civility, or even of decency, on your part in sending me such an epistle.

“With respect to DENS and the Rhemish Notes, I confess to you that I feel the utmost indifference as to the Resolutions your meeting of the 12th of July may adopt. Resolve away as fast and as long as you please, I care not ; gratify yourselves as to your mode of resolving ; your resolutions can harm only yourselves, and that I admit you have a plain and obvious right to do. Nobody ought to interfere in any way to prevent you. I am quite sure I will not. Your Resolutions, therefore, for aught I care, may be reprobatory or approbatory, laudatory, or explanatory, or any other Tory you please. It is a species, allow me to say, of tom-foolery, or rather Tory-foolery, with which I would not, upon any consideration, interfere. Accept, I beg of you, my full consent to your drawing up and passing any resolutions you please.

“As to naming members of Parliament and sharing tickets, and all that fantastic mummery, it really surprises me that a gentleman of your good sense, could think that such an absurd farce could be entertained for one moment. I should be laughed at, if I were to propose it to any Members of Parliament gifted with common sense, and, if I refrain from laughing at it in your case, it is only because I do not choose to treat you with any want of courtesy.

"The whole affair is, in plain truth, one of those miserable mismanagements which cannot be described, by any English word, with accuracy. It is only in French that you can find their right name. They are called 'niaiseries,' and such I treat them.

"I cannot conclude without, in sober sadness, expressing my most unfeigned regret, that the very name of Religion should be tarnished by these theatrical buffooneries. I cannot possibly lend them any countenance, either directly or indirectly. Religion is indeed too awful a thing to be made the subject of mountebank exhibitions. It is by far of too tremendous an importance, to be approached in any other spirit than that of humility surrounded by the purest charity. The spirit of charitable humility is that in which Religious controversy should be proposed and carried on. It is so conducted in many Protestant countries, and the consequence is—I say it in no vain boast—the wise and the good are daily forsaking the variegated errors of Anti-Catholic belief, and crowding into the ranks of those who endeavour 'to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,' for 'There is ONE body, and ONE spirit, even as ye are called in ONE hope of your calling, ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM; ONE GOD and Father of all.'

"That that gracious and good God may, in the plenitude of his mercies, recall your fellow-labourers from their errors, and guide them to that ONE FAITH which your fathers and our fathers left to God, is, I hope, the humble and fervent prayer of your obedient servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL.

"REV. J. R. PAGE."

“THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION TO DANIEL O’CONNELL,
ESQ., M.P.

“ No. 2, Exeter Hall, July 8, 1836.

“SIR—The Rev. Mr. PAGE, to whom your letter of the 29th ult., is addressed, having laid it before the Committee of the Protestant Association, we are instructed to acknowledge its receipt, and to make one or two brief remarks as to its contents.

“The object of the meeting which is proposed to be held at Exeter Hall, on Thursday next, is chiefly to pursue that very inquiry which you yourself opened at the Catholic Board in Dublin, in the year 1817. At that board, in December of that year, you moved and obtained a committee ‘to prepare a disavowal of the Rhemish Notes.’ Subsequently, on three different occasions, you obtained, for that committee, ‘further time’ to agree on its disavowal. At last the board itself was broken up without agreeing on any such disavowal; and although you, Sir, had declared that ‘not a moment should be lost’ in condemning ‘these scandalous notes,’ never, either through the medium of the Catholic Board or of the Catholic Association, has this promised disavowal appeared. Now the Protestants, as you, Sir, are well aware, have quite as much concern in this question as the Romanists; and it is a perfectly legitimate object for their investigation. That inquiry, therefore, which you yourself commenced, but which for some reason or other you afterwards allowed to drop, we now propose to resume, and, as you were so immediately concerned in the agitation of the question, we thought it but fair to invite your attendance. Whether it may suit your views to be present or not is quite a matter for your own consideration. Under any circumstances, the committee will persevere in their original intention. The arrangements proposed to you for the meeting were

merely those which have usually been adopted in such cases, and on which your friends have usually agreed. They were acted upon in the public discussion at the Roman Catholic College at Downside, in January, 1834, with which circumstance you can hardly be entirely unacquainted—In neither the subject for discussion, therefore, nor the arrangements proposed, do the committee feel that they are at all open to the remarks which you have chosen to make.

“Of the character of the gentleman who proposes to introduce the question, and towards whom you express yourself in such opprobrious terms, the committee feel it quite unnecessary to say anything, except to express their unanimous feeling that the invitation conveyed in our former letter conferred an honour rather than an insult.

“In conclusion, allow us to call your attention to a degree of inconsistency or obscurity which appears in your remarks on the religious part of the question. At the commencement of your letter you address us as ‘fellow-Christians,’ while at its close you designate us as ‘anti-Catholics,’ and as having no part in the ‘One Lord, one faith, one baptism’ of the Christian or Catholic Church.

“Now, Sir, we cannot imagine you to be so ignorant of the meaning of words, as not to know that if you rightly address us as ‘Fellow-Christians,’ then we cannot be beyond the pale of the Catholic or universal church; while, if you really believe us, as the close of your letter seems to intimate, to have no part in that ‘one Lord, one faith, one baptism,’ which belongs to all Christians, then your previous appeal to us, as ‘Fellow-Christians’ cannot escape the charge of insincerity.

“You close by auspiciously our ‘return to that one faith which our fathers and your fathers held of God.’

It is our hope and confidence that that faith is already possessed by us. Your church, as you are doubtless aware, expresses her faith in four creeds.—Three of these are of ancient date—the Apostle's Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian. All these, 'which your fathers and our fathers held of God,' the Protestant churches at this present moment cordially accept and maintain. But the church of Rome has added a further one of more modern date—the creed of Pope Pius IV., promulgated only in the year 1564, the authority of which we entirely deny. It is upon this novelty alone that the difference turns. 'The faith which your fathers and our fathers held of God,' is ours still. May we not, therefore, with more justice and propriety, call upon you to give up your modern additions, and to join us in that faith whose antiquity you profess to revere?

“ We have the honour to be, &c.

“ (Signed by the Secretaries.)”

The meeting, referred to in the foregoing correspondence, was held on the day named, Thursday, the 12th of July. As an abridged account of this meeting will elucidate the circumstances which are to follow—we give it from a London Paper:—

“ A general meeting of the Protestant Association, was held on Thursday, the 12th of July, at the great room, Exeter-Hall, for the purpose, as stated in the advertisement, of pointing out the peculiar perils in which the Protestants of Ireland are involved. The meeting was well attended, and we observed on the platform Mr. PLUMTRE, M.P., Sir A. AGNEW, Bart, M.P., and a large number of clergymen of the Church of England. Soon after 11 o'clock, Mr. GEORGE FINCH was called to the Chair. He stated that he had undertaken this duty in consequence of the absence of several distinguished individuals—not

from any neglect on their part, but from circumstances over which they had no control. He had letters from Lord KENYON and Lord WINCHELSEA, expressing their deep regret at being unable to preside at the present meeting. He was sure that if he needed any support in maintaining order and regularity in their proceedings, that support would be afforded. It had been decided that no person should address the meeting, except the Rev. Mr. M'GHEE, or members of the committee. The committee had been compelled to come to this decision from a sense of justice to the parties accused. They felt that only one of two courses was open to them—either to restrict the speaking to one side, or if the Church of Rome was to be heard, to select as her advocate, the most talented individual they could discover. Impressed with the importance of what was due to the Church of Rome, a letter was addressed to Mr. O'CONNELL, who not only declined to attend, but had treated the subject with a degree of levity, which was easily accounted for, when the reasons of his absence were considered. He entreated the meeting to listen to the Rev. Mr. M'GHEE, whose character as a Christian minister was too well known to need any panegyric.

“The Rev. R. M'GHEE then said, that it was a twelvemonth, last Monday, since he had the honour of appearing in that hall, to prove the real principles which were held and propagated by the Roman Church in Ireland. It was needless to mention every ordeal through which he had since been called upon to pass. Priests denied, Bishops had abjured, Ministers had declaimed, the Press had alternately ridiculed and argued, poetry had exhausted all her powers—they had done everything but disprove. He again stood forward in the simplicity of truth, to assert that not one single fact which he had laid before the public had been disproved—no proposition

had been falsified ; not an argument had been invalidated, or a conclusion shaken. He now distinctly disclaimed the intention of imputing to any Roman Catholic, the awful principles which would be laid before the meeting to-day. He did this in consequence of letters which had been addressed to him, requiring that individuals should be heard. It was not his fault, if the Hall was not to-day filled with Roman Catholics. An opportunity had been offered to the most powerful and caustic advocate of the Roman Church, to dispute the doctrines that would be laid before the meeting. A letter had been addressed to the Rev. Dr. MURRAY, accompanied with an offer to pay the expenses of any gentleman who might be selected from the Irish Priesthood, to defend their church. They had, however, with abundant time for preparation, suffered judgment to go by default. The Reverend Gentleman then referred to Mr. O'CONNELL's letter, in answer to the invitation to attend the meeting ; and in alluding to the expression, ' that unhappy schism,' said that, fanatical as he might be, he would deal only with facts. It was no proof of insanity to appeal to documents—it was a mark of conscious guilt not to reply. The hon. member for Kilkenny spoke of ' that meek prelate,' Dr. MURRAY. The meek prelate was, perhaps, the first client the honourable member had had, whose cause was so exceedingly good, that he would not undertake his defence. The honourable member had granted the meeting his full consent to agree to any resolution they pleased, they would take advantage of it, although no one could say, for how great a length of time Protestants might be at liberty to stand forward, to maintain God's Word against the superstition of the Church of Rome. The Reverend Gentleman went into a theological argument against DEN'S doctrine,

and the edition of the Bible, published under the sanction of Dr. TROY. He then alluded to a document of a nature which he believed had never been heard of in England, since the days of QUEEN ELIZABETH. *It was a letter from the present Pope to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, in 1832—so atrocious a document, that if it had not been well authenticated, he could not have credited it. There were, however, means of authenticating it as a truly Papist bull. It was by the insertion of certain words, which made the document law. In this letter those words were printed in brackets. The letter stated that the Pope was not unaware of the difficulties which encompassed the Clergy, situated as they were in the midst of heresy. It then gave directions for their conduct. They were to seem to a certain extent to countenance these impious opinions; they were to endeavour to divide the heretics in a wonderful manner, blinding their eyes to matters affecting their well-being. The letter expressed satisfaction that the parliamentary grant had been withdrawn from the schools which had been established by the heretics in all parts of the country, and which were secretly undermining the Catholic faith; and that other schools had been built, which would be more under their control. They were to speak to the people in praise of the new schools. Who would have thought that the Pope of Rome was laying the foundation of every new school in Ireland? They were to be careful that nothing came forth derogatory to the most blessed Virgin Mary. The children were to be taught little or nothing at all, and the priests were to cultivate the good opinion of different heretics. The rev. gentleman read various other extracts, and said that if a commentary were wanting to DEN'S' Theology, the Rhemish Bible, and the other documents, he would only produce this letter."*

We have given, in Italics, the statement which afterwards made so much noise in both kingdoms, and we take from the London *Standard* and the *Morning Chronicle*—first a letter from the Chairman of the meeting, with the editorial remarks of the *Standard*—then a letter from the Secretaries of the Protestant Association, addressed to the *Morning Chronicle*, and introduced by the Editor's comments, in order to place before the reader, the full particulars of an affair, which, for some years after, was the subject of general conversation:—The following letter was addressed to the Editor of the *Standard*:—

“Westbrook, July 19.

“SIR—As I presided at the meeting in Exeter-hall, at which the letter from Pope GREGORY XVI., to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland was quoted, I feel myself called upon to express my sentiments upon the subject. I cannot say how deeply I deplore the publication of the letter in question. In the preface is contained a sustained fraud. It commences by saying that ‘the translator of the following curious document is, unfortunately, not at liberty to explain the manner in which it came into his hands; were he able to do so, the doubts which may now, perhaps, be expressed as to its authenticity, could not have been raised: he must, therefore, trust to the sagacity of the reader to discern in it those marks of genuineness which no fictitious document has ever been found to possess.’ Page 7, contains a libellous charge against the Pope, as giving to the Irish Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, an express permission to disguise their real sentiments, and to act in all such matters, ‘according to the necessity of the times.’ My much valued friend, the Rev. R. M’GHEE, must have overlooked these passages, and their only intelligible im-

port, when he expressed himself so mildly respecting the document, and recommended it to the perusal of Protestants, instead of instantly denouncing it as libellous and unchristian. In the name of the sacred cause in which we are engaged, I would reprobate such 'pious frauds.' Let us borrow no weapons of defence from Satan's armoury. The evidences adduced by Mr. M'GHEE, during the first three hours of his speech were, irrefragable; the letter unwittingly referred to, by him, subsequently, I can only designate by as impudent forgery.

"I have the honour to be, your most obedient and humble servant.

"G. FINCH."

On this letter, the *Standard* has the following:—

"This is a strong reproof, but it is just. We are the more willing to subscribe to Mr. FINCH's condemnation of the forgery, because we see that the report of the Exeter-hall meeting has found its way into the Dublin papers, unaccompanied by any explanation on the part of the author of the fabricated letter. That gentleman is under a grievous delusion, if he thinks that a very full explanation is not due from him. As to Mr. M'GHEE, the worst that can be said to him is, that he has been the dupe of an imposition, aided, perhaps, by his own zeal, and the influence of a surprise."

The *Morning Chronicle*, prefaces the letter of the Secretaries thus:—

"A letter has been sent to us by the secretaries of the Protestant Association, which will be found below. The object of the writers is, to vindicate themselves and M'GHEE from the suspicion of being willing parties to the forgery of the Papal letter, and to the publication of that forged document, as such. But though we have inserted their letter, we do not conceive they were enti-

tled to call on us to do so, because they have not been accused by us of being the parties to the infamous proceeding, nor have they any right to attempt a vindication of the utterer of the forgery. This letter throws no new light upon the transaction. It merely states, what we have not gainsayed—that the committee of the Protestant association had no hand in the getting up of the forgery. But it leaves the forgery, and the author of the forgery steeped to the lips in the infamy, which must surround men who resort to means so profligate for the achievement of any object. It is not denied that M'GHEE read a letter purporting to have come from the Pope, to the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland; it is not denied that he dwelt with vehemence for more than two hours upon the substance of the letter, and that a deep impression was produced upon the minds of his auditory; it is admitted that that letter was from beginning to end, a forgery, (attributed by the *Standard* to the Rev. Mr. TODD, a Clergyman of the Established Church, and a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin), and no one has ventured to deny that M'GHEE vouched for the authenticity of the document. So far for the exhibition at Exeter Hall on Thursday. Well, on Friday morning, we unhesitatingly asserted that the letter was a fabrication. On that evening the *Standard* was silent, as were the *Post*, the *Herald* and the *Times* of the next morning; but on Saturday evening, out came the *Standard*, with a long article, in which the Papal letter was characterised as the most important, beyond measure, of 'all the important statements in Mr. M'GHEE's eloquent address.' And in the same page of the same paper, there also appeared a letter of M'GHEE's announcing the letter, not as a forgery, which it was, but as an 'ingenious device of his learned friend' the fabricator; and recommending

' the Protestants' to have and to study the villainous fabrication, as ' a document well worth reading (we quote from memory), though fictitious.' Here was a distinct approval of the forgery, after the fabrication was discovered by M'GHEE, assuming that he was previously ignorant of its real character. Now the abettor of forgery is worse than the forger. The latter may merely intend a bit of irony, but the abettor is a forger with malice preposse in his heart. As such M'GHEE stands convicted upon his own evidence; and if the Protestant Association do not speedily sever all connexion between him and them, the public cannot avoid holding the Association responsible for the guilt of their instrument and confederate. M'GHEE must be expelled the Society by a published note, if that body desire to preserve their characters free from impeachment. So long as the deliberate abettor of an infamous and wicked fraud, is suffered to continue a Member of the Protestant Association, so long will the public voice declare them corrupt accomplices in his abomination. As to the concluding paragraph in the letter of Messrs. PAGE, QUIN, and WOODWARD, we have only to remark, that, as the forged letter formed the staple of M'GHEE'S harangue, and as all his other statements were, as the *Standard* has declared, ' mere trifling in comparison with that letter,' we do not see any reason for troubling ourselves or our readers with ' mere trifling,' when a more important portion of the proceeding at Exeter-hall, claims our attention. Doubtless the *Tartuffes* would call off our attention to other topics, if they could; but, with their leave or without it, we will pursue our own course. Surely it is not to be supposed that we would waste our time and space in reviewing the ' mere trifling' of an utterer and abettor of forgery, and allow the profligate devices of the enemies of civil and religious liberty, and of the peace of society, to escape exposure and reprobation.

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

“ SIR—The brief reports which the daily papers were able to give of the meeting of Thursday last, at Exeter-hall, have necessarily left the facts as to the production of the ‘ Letter of Pope GREGORY XVI.’ in considerable obscurity, and the Committee of the Protestant Association feel that they have some claim upon you to give insertion to a brief statement of the case connected with the pamphlet in question, in order that their concern, as well as Mr. M’GHEE’s, in this matter, may be properly understood.

“ Mr. M’GHEE arrived in town a very few days before the meeting of Thursday last, and attended a committee held two days previous to that meeting; at that committee the topics, to be discussed on the following Thursday, were gone over, and no allusion was ever made to the pamphlet in question, neither Mr. M’GHEE himself, nor any member of the committee, being then even aware of its existence.

“ On the evening before the meeting, at a very late hour, a friend of Mr. M’GHEE’s called upon him with this pamphlet, which he stated to have been published by a gentleman in Ireland, in whose character Mr. M’GHEE had the highest confidence. Hastily adopting it, therefore, as a genuine document, Mr. M’GHEE produced it to the meeting, and read extracts from its pages; not having, however, previously mentioned the subject to any member of the committee. Two days after the meeting, by a communication from a connexion of the author’s, Mr. M’GHEE was made acquainted with the real character of the work, and he then lost no time in transmitting to the daily press, a letter explaining it to be a fictitious production.

“ These being the facts of the case, the committee of the Protestant Association feel that they ought not to be

made answerable for the production of this pamphlet. With respect to Mr. M'GHEE they feel assured, that no one who has any knowledge of that gentleman's character, will imagine it possible that he could ever have quoted such a document. had he not at the time really believed it to be genuine and authentic. They regret that he should have so hastily adopted this belief; and they also wish it to be expressly understood, that the weapons of truth are the only weapons they feel themselves justified in using, and that, therefore, they never have countenanced, and never can countenance, the use or publication of fictitious documents, in connexion with the great interests which it is their aim to advance.

“ The Committee, however, are happy to observe that the chief matters brought before the meeting by Mr. M'GHEE, according to the arrangement previously made by the committee, were fully and incontrovertibly established; and they cannot avoid seeing that the circumstance above alluded to, and with reference to which they feel the deepest regret, has been chiefly used by the opponents of the Protestant cause, to divert the attention of the public from those facts, which they know to have been established, and which they feel to be fatal to their interests.

“ We have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient humble servants,

“ JAMES R. PAGE,
 “ G. H. WOODWARD, } Secretaries.
 “ HENRY QUIN, }

“ Exeter-hall, July 19.”

Thus did the third attempt to injure the Ministry signally fail.

The Parliamentary Session, being now nearly brought to a close—O'CONNELL returned to Dublin, and, for nearly three weeks, kept up a perpetual round of agitation. He had meetings, of the National Association for

obtaining Justice for Ireland, three times a week—and at each of these meetings his practice was to make several speeches on different subjects. The ease with which they were delivered—thinking as he did aloud—was their great charm. It seemed, as if—had he physical strength—he could go on in one perpetual flow of eloquence, alternately brilliant—humourous—argumentative—and anecdotal,—his audience never tired of listening to him. By these alternations, he kept their attention alive; and his calm, deliberate manner—and distinct musical voice, enabled the most distant and the most stupid in the crowd, to understand every word he said—Thus it was, that even if he addressed them every day—instead of three or four times a week—and made fifty, instead of a dozen speeches—they would still hang upon every syllable that fell from him—and every syllable would have an additional charm and a freshness which no other orator that ever lived was capable of imparting to speeches in which he had, of necessity, to make use of, and work up over and over again, the same materials. But his mind was so stored with anecdote—his memory was so ready and inexhaustible, that he was able to make the dullest subject agreeable, and it was only where he was shakled down by statistics—as in the case of his Repeal speech in the House of Commons, that he ever seemed prosy. If we take even a passing glance over any of the many speeches he delivered at the time to which we are now referring—at the “National Association”—“the Trades’ Union,” “the Independent Club,” &c.—the eye cannot fail to rest on passages full of wit, humour and anecdote. Speaking of common sense, for instance, as a characteristic necessary for any nation that would arrive at permanent greatness, he illustrated his view thus:—

“I remember amusing a great number of JOHN BULLS with a story of a Frenchman and an Englishman, who

were arguing about the respective greatness of the two countries; see, said the Frenchman, what a nation France is, we were the first to invent ruffles; aye, said the Englishman, but we added the shirt. This was the common sense of England; they added the shirt to the ruffle, and the Irish people will add useful and honest Magistrates to the Orange ruffles; or if they take them entirely away, the shirt will not be less useful without them."

Speaking of the possible return of the Tories to power, he depicted what would be the consequence—the Police would be crammed with Orangemen—the Orange fever would again poison the Magistracy—He then went on to say—

"I will not say the same of the Judges. Oh no! But I remember a story with which I was once much struck;— 'Whose house is that,' said a stranger, once, passing through the County of Tipperary, as he indicated to a countryman a handsome residence by which his attention was caught. 'One Colonel PEPPER's, your honour,' was the reply. 'And what sort of man is he?' 'Oh, worse nor the devil, the Lord save us from harm.' 'And whose place is that?' pointing to a house at no great distance. 'Colonel LEGGE's, your honour.' 'Well, and what kind of man is he?' 'Why, he is worse nor Colonel PEPPER, please your honour.' Now, I will not say anything of the kind with regard to individual judges."

Thus did he convey, in a short anecdote, a biting sarcasm, while he kept the attention of his audience alive and active. Thus, in three weeks after he returned to Ireland, by his unceasing energy, was he enabled to keep up the agitation for Justice. It required his master mind and his great influence to effect this, for the hearts of the mass of the people were not in the struggle. Their hopes were alone centred in obtaining a Repeal of the Union. They cherished the belief, that it would secure for them fair remu-

neration for their industry—that it would improve the condition of the tenantry—give them an interest in the soil they cultivated, and eradicate, from the country, all religious ascendancy. When this question was, for the time, put aside, during the experiment on the justice of England, they could scarcely be induced to join the middle class in seeking for Municipal Reform, or in accepting any settlement of the Tithe question, short of total abolition. An appropriation, at some remote period, of some forty thousand a year, for education—while the establishment, as the sign of religious ascendancy, was to be preserved, for the benefit of the minority—could never satisfy them, and, therefore, except that, at elections, they did their duty fearlessly, the people were quiescent.

The Session of 1836 was brought to a close in August, and, though we will not accompany Lord LYNDHURST—in his review of its acts, we will agree with him thus far that nothing was done. But the cause was the obstructive policy of the Lords. They were in hopes, by continued opposition, to effect such a curtailment in the franchises and other reforms, proposed by the Government, as to make them scarcely worth acceptance. The Government, anxious to prevent any such split between both houses, as might dislocate the institutions of the State, were willing to compromise; to give much, and to take as large a measure as they could by some display of firmness obtain. The Lords felt confident that on an appeal to the country, the Tories would win a majority—the Government, on the other hand, with the majority they had, were determined to fight the battle with their Lordships. Thus, with the confidence inspired by a large Conservative support, outside doors—did the Lords impede the progress of amelioration—thus did the Government, backed by the Commons, persevere, and thus were the Irish people, in the struggle of English parties,

deprived of their rights—namely, equal rights with England and Scotland.

Another opportunity presented itself this year to carry on the crusade of calumny against O'CONNELL. He had been always a supporter of the "short time" work for children in the Factories. He was looked upon, by the operatives, as one of their parliamentary leaders, on this question. He had taken a part at public meetings in the agitation in its favor. However, to the astonishment of the short-time agitators, O'CONNELL voted in favour of POULETT THOMSON'S measure, which, while it regulated and ameliorated the Factory system to some extent, did not do what the operatives looked for—namely, to limit the hours of work for women, and for children under thirteen years, to ten hours. The arguments in favor of short time are many and strong. First, on the score of humanity; it was a dreadful system that obliged pregnant women, for instance, and almost infant children to toil on for sixteen or seventeen hours a day, with scarcely time to take their meals, or enjoy any recreation. Instances of the most melancholy character are related of the effects of such a system. Secondly, on the score of religion, of morals, and of social happiness. These women and children are the producers of the manufactures of England. Something is due to them from society. They should have time to be taught their duties to God, to their neighbour, and to themselves—the children should be instructed, and the women should be allowed to attend to their household duties, so that their houses should be the homes of morality, instead of dens of vice. On the other hand, if the hours of labour were diminished to ten hours, it would have so materially lessened production, and of course raised prices, that the English manufacturer would have been unable to compete successfully with the continental and American fabrics,

even in the English market. Utter ruin to operatives and manufacturers would have been the consequence. It was with the greatest difficulty that, even with the utmost amount of toil, they were enabled to hold their ground against the active competition that was springing up, and the manufacturing interest was in a most depressed condition. The philanthropists in the House of Commons, of whom Lord ASHLEY was the leader and the ornament, maintained with truth that evil should not be done, that good might come of it—that the women and children should not be consigned to increasing toil, to accumulate millions into the coffers of the rich, or even to increase the power and glory of England. The political economists, and the leaders of both parties in the house, maintained that there should be as little legislative interference as possible with labour; and it would, if unrestricted, regulate itself according to the ordinary principles of supply and demand. Their statistical calculations went to show, that if the duration of labour at the Factories was limited to ten hours, the result would inevitably be the common ruin, not only of the manufacturers, but also of those in whose behalf the plan was advocated. Mr. POULETT THOMSON'S measure introduced improvements which went, in some degree, to mitigate the evils complained of. Inspectors were, if we mistake not, to be appointed to visit the factories periodically, and regulations enforced for the benefit of the children. Notwithstanding this, the short-time advocates resisted the ministerial measure, and the second reading was carried by a bare majority. This happened in May, 1836—before Mr. O'CONNELL was unseated for Dublin, and a fortnight before it was thought of getting up a subscription to enable him to meet the enormous expenses he had incurred. He voted for the ministerial measure, and there is no doubt

his votes, and the votes he influenced, gave the Government a majority. This increased the indignation felt against him. The moment the subscription was set on foot, and that a thousand pounds was collected for the fund in Manchester, it was broadly stated that he was bribed. The calumny first assumed a substantial form in the July number of *Blackwood's Magazine*, in an article on the *Cotton Manufacture and Factory system*.

“The second reading of Mr. THOMSON'S Bill, was ably contested on the 10th May, and after the eloquent and unanswerable protests of Lord ASHLEY, the Right Honourable HENRY GOULBURN, Messrs. FIELDEN, BROTHERTON, and other friends of the factory child, to which we can do no more than refer, was carried by a majority of Two; the numbers being 178 for, and 176 against it; after which Government, in dismay, abandoned the foul design of further persecuting the infant operative population. The division was signalled by an instance of nameless turpitude, of which one wretch alone, in the whole British dominions, would have been capable. Mr. DANIEL O'CONNELL had spoken on various occasions, in and out of Parliament, in behalf of the factory children; three days before the debate alluded to, he had eagerly sought Lord ASHLEY, to assure him of his support, comprehending, of course, the whole weight of ‘the tail.’ On the day of trial, to the indignant scorn and contempt of all men, he and they voted against him, and against the infant supplicants for mercy. Our readers can be at no loss to guess the nature of the argument by which the disgusting apostacy was gilded. The sordid Judas of these days betrayed them for gold. Three days after the traitor had fulfilled the conditions of the compact, and had sealed the bond of his iniquity, a purse of £700, from the Unitarian and Dissenting mill-owners and others; was presented to him.

It had been kept back by the parties in London, charged to negotiate the treaty with him, until the noxious reptile had acquitted his engagement—the spoil was then claimed and surrendered.”

And afterwards, in August, the following, from the pen of Mr. BELL, who had been editor of the *True Sun*, and a strong radical, appeared in the first number of the *Mercury*, a new paper, which he had started :—

“ I deem it my duty to let Mr. O’CONNELL know the very heavy imputation under which he labours—in order that he may be prepared to defend his own conduct, on the next occasion that may present itself to him for settling scores with the Radicals of England !

“ Mr. O’CONNELL is openly accused, in the north of England, of having sold himself, on the factory question, to the mill-owners. Mr. POTTER, of Manchester, is stated to have guaranteed Mr. O’CONNELL a thousand pounds, and the support of his party, in forwarding the English subscription, in exchange for Mr. O’CONNELL’s support on that occasion.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL, after pledging himself over and over again, to support Mr. FIELDEN’s ten hours’ bill, did, most unquestionably, violate these solemn pledges, by voting with the government. Mr. POTTER and the other mill-owners did also, unquestionably, present Mr. O’CONNELL with a thousand pounds.

“ I heard the accusation which I have related publicly made in Yorkshire, by a gentleman of the highest character for veracity and humanity. That gentleman did not profess to guarantee the truth of the statement ; but he gave his authority, and the gentleman to whom he referred is one of Mr. O’CONNELL’s warmest supporters in Manchester.

“ I am ready, if required, to furnish any well-wisher to Mr. O’CONNELL, with the name of the parties to whom

I have alluded. Mr. O'CONNELL himself is, undoubtedly, bound to lose no time in explaining the matter to the satisfaction of the labouring men of England."

Now, before we go further, it may be well here to observe that Mr. POTTER, who exerted himself so conspicuously in Manchester, in forwarding the O'CONNELL subscription, was no such owner, nor was one-fifth of the thousand pounds subscribed by Mill-owners.

In October, the following correspondence, arising out of the above paragraph, took place—between Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. CONDY, Editor of the *Manchester Advertiser*.

" My informant, in regard of Mr. O'CONNELL's conduct on the factory question, was Mr. OASTLER, of Fixby Hall, near Huddersfield. The accusation was made at, or rather after a public dinner at Huddersfield. Mr. OASTLER gave as his authority Mr. CONDY, of the *Manchester Advertiser*. Mr. COSTELLOE, the solicitor of Mr. O'CONNELL, was mentioned as Mr. CONDY's informant.

" Sept. 28th, 1836."

" J. B.

" Darrynane Abbey, 11th Oct. 1836.

" MY DEAR SIR—The above is a copy of a memorandum written by Mr. BELL, and signed with his initials, which was handed by him at his office to a friend of mine. I have sent the original to Mr. COSTELLOE, my solicitor, who you perceive at once is entitled to a denial from you, of having said any such thing of him. Indeed I could not, for one moment, credit any man, who told me you could be capable of such misrepresentation. Besides, you have too much good sense and intellect to countenance this Mr. OASTLER in so absurd a calumny against any man, and especially against one to whom, as a public man, you have shown kindness and not hostility.—Enable me, then, I pray, to contradict this Mr. OAST-

LER publicly, which I mean to do whenever a proper occasion arises. I want these things from you; first, an explicit denial of having used Mr. COSTELLOE'S name, as *your* informant; and *secondly*, an explicit denial of your having been the informant of Mr. OASTLER. In short, I beg of you to enable me, in the best way—and you know how to do it—to contradict this man, OASTLER, so as to deprive him of all credit—and surely, whoever invented this absurd and vicious calumny, deserves to be deprived of all credit. It is, in short, I need not only tell you, a lie, in all its circumstances and details—as far as regards my vote on the second reading of Mr. POULETT THOMSON'S bill—which is the vote alluded to, I presume—being influenced by anything but my conscientious conviction, arising from the facts, and the arguments adduced in the debate, and which were in my judgment totally unanswered on the occasion.

“ If you, my good Sir, feel any interest in knowing what did occur on that debate to change my opinion, I have not the least objection to state to you the reasons which convinced me; but not as yielding any concession to the impossible lie of OASTLER or Mr. BELL; because you perceive I am not at liberty to do so, until I have traced the falsehood home to one or other of these pretensions. When that is done, you can command me; and then I desire no better judge than yourself, if I know you rightly, to say whether my vote was not that which I ought, under the circumstances, have given.

“ I have the honour to be, my dear Sir, your very faithful and obedient servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.

“ G. CONDY, Esq., barrister-at-law, *Manchester Advertiser* Office.

“ May I ask you to preserve this letter?”

To this the following answer was returned:---

“ Saturday Morning.

“ MY DEAR SIR—I lose not a moment in forwarding to you the two things which you demand of me. First, an explicit denial of having used Mr. COSTELLOE's name as my informant; and, secondly, an explicit denial of my having been the informant of Mr. OASTLER. I knew nothing of your motives for voting with Mr. THOMSON, and could only guess that you thought it necessary, because you were resolved to support the ministry in their English measures. Of that vote, I published my disapprobation¹ at the time. I have acted with OASTLER, SADLER, Lord ASHLEY, HINDLEY, and every body else, who would assist in getting rid of the plague spot of steam factories. Therefore, while I make, in the fullest sense of a man of honour, the denial which you require, you will allow me to say, that I do it with no view to bring confusion or discredit on any body. I am not yet convinced that OASTLER gave Mr. BELL, whose person I do not know, the information contained in the memorandum. Be that as it may, neither of them could have anything of the kind from me. The only point of COSTELLOE's conversation, conveyed by me, was the detail which he made to you about the jocular manner of giving and receiving your health, at a gentleman's house where we were both present. COSTELLOE's discretion and regard for you will make any declaration from him unnecessary. It is with considerable pain that I differ from you upon questions of public policy; because I must always remember, that you were the rescuing Hercules of Ireland, and the all-powerful ally of reform in England. If you favor me with your reasons, apart from this unlucky topic of our correspondence, I shall be glad to give them the same publicity I gave my objections to that vote. I will preserve your letter. I enclose extracts of one which I am sending off to OASTLER, relating to the matter in question.

“ I have the honour to be, my dear Sir, your very obedient, faithful servant,

“ GEORGE CONDY.

“ D. O’CONNELL, Esq., M.P.”

Mr. PATRICK COSTELLOE, the respectable Dublin Solicitor, whose name was introduced into this transaction, published the following statement :—

“ Mr. PATRICK COSTELLOE, having ascertained that Mr. JOHN BELL had communicated to Mr. O’CONNELL the statement which he has since published in the *London Mercury*, left Dublin on Saturday, the 15th Oct., accompanied by his friend, Capt. BELLHOUSE, and proceeded to Manchester. On Monday morning, at 11 o’clock, Capt. BELLHOUSE called on Mr. CONDY (the barrister), whose name is introduced in the statement, as the authority of Mr. OASTLER, and asked him whether Mr. COSTELLOE had ever, as alleged by Mr. BELL, stated to him that Mr. O’CONNELL had got a sum of £1,000, or any other sum, for his vote on the factory question, or held any conversation with him to the effect. Mr. CONDY immediately declared that Mr. COSTELLOE never made any such statement to him, and never had any such conversation with him, and wrote Mr. COSTELLOE a letter to that effect. Mr. COSTELLOE immediately forwarded the letter to Mr. O’CONNELL, and, with his friend, left Manchester at half-past one o’clock the same day.”

About the same time, the following appeared in Mr. BELL’s paper :—

“ The subjoined communications, from Mr. OASTLER, and from the secretaries to the Huddersfield Short Time Committee, will be read with interest.

“ Mr. OASTLER’s letter, it will be perceived, fully justifies the use which I made of that gentleman’s name. Mr. OASTLER adds some particulars as to Mr. O’CONNELL’s embarrassed circumstances, which I did not deem myself warranted in dwelling upon.

“The Secretaries to the Huddersfield Short Time Committee, prove that Mr. O'CONNELL has refused to explain the reasons which induced him to break his pledges on the factory question.

“There is a statement in the postscript to Mr. OASTLER's letter, which merits attention. Mr. OASTLER declares that the Roman Catholic bishop has ordered the priests in the Manchester district to abstain from interference on behalf of the Factory children. If this statement be accurate, perhaps Mr. O'CONNELL, and the Roman Catholic bishop in question, may be acted on by the same influences.

“The whole affair must now be thoroughly investigated.

“J. B.”

“TO JOHN BELL, ESQ., EDITOR OF THE LONDON MERCURY.

“DEAR SIR—I have this moment received the *London Mercury*, of Oct. 16, 1836. I have perused the leading article, respecting Mr. O'CONNELL, the Factory Children, and the One Thousand Pounds.

“You will, I think, expect to hear from me on the subject. I have great pleasure in handing you a full and correct statement of facts; of which you are at perfect liberty to make what use you please. I had certainly no expectation that the conversation would have been published; if I had, I would have given you the statement in writing at the time;—I rejoice, however, that the affair is before the public, and, without further preliminary, I will proceed to state all I know respecting it.

“You will recollect, that on the evening of the 3d August, (I believe that was the time), a public dinner was given to Mr. CHRISTOPHER TINKER, of Huddersfield, on his return from his six months' incarceration in York Castle, for having sold an unstamped newspaper. The friends of Mr. TINKER expressed a wish that I should

dine with them on that occasion. For reasons, which I explained at the dinner, I attended ; at that dinner you were the Chairman.

“ When the dinner and the speeches were concluded, you will recollect, that about ten or a dozen of us retired into a private parlour, where a discussion was begun, between some English Radicals and some Irish Radicals, as to ‘ whether Mr. O’CONNELL was or was not the friend of the working-classes.’ The Irish Radicals maintained ‘ that he was the friend of the Labourer, because he carried Emancipation, and was also for annual Parliaments and universal suffrage.’ The English Radicals, on the contrary, asserted ‘ that when he carried the Emancipation Bill, if he had been the friend of the working classes, he could not have disfranchised hundreds of thousands of forty-shilling Freeholders ; and that, as for universal suffrage, and annual Parliaments, had he really been a friend of those measures, he could not have remained so long in Parliament, without having brought them forward there ;’ and they maintained, ‘ that Mr. O’CONNELL was in reality nothing else than a political-economist Malthusian Whig.’—They mentioned his conduct with respect to the Dorchester labourers, and stamps on newspapers ; comparing his declarations with his actions in the house. They asserted, ‘ that the man who could, all his life, refuse the poor of his native land the right of relief from the soil, must—let his professions be what they might, be the enemy of the Irish poor ; and that the man who could be so cruel, and so false, as to tell the people of England that the Poor Law Amendment bill ‘ worked well,’ could be none other than the deadliest enemy of the labouring classes of England.’

“ During this debate, I asked the Irish Radicals, ‘ how it was possible, that any man who was the friend of the

poor, could have acted as Mr. O'CONNELL had acted with regard to the factory bill?' I stated, 'that Mr. O'CONNELL had been recognised by all the short time committees, as one of their parliamentary leaders; that I had myself heard him, at the public meeting on the ten hours bill, in the city of London, when the Lord Mayor presided. make a most eloquent and heart-rending appeal, in favour of that measure; that he had several times spoken most affectingly, on that subject, in the House of Commons; that in point of fact, he had always treated it as a question of mercy against blood.' I stated 'that he was pledged up to the very neck on their question, both to the public, to the operatives, and to the House of Commons; that he was well informed on all the facts, and all the circumstances of the case; and that on the very night on which Mr. P. THOMSON brought forward his motion, he had pledged himself to oppose that motion with his vote and influence; instead of which, without making a speech or assigning publicly any reason, he broke all his promises and pledges; supported Mr. POULETT THOMSON's motion, and carried over with himself a good many joints of his tail; and that, since then, he had been repeatedly written to by the short time committees, and the friends of the factory children, for an explanation of his conduct; but that he had maintained a sturdy and a sulky silence.'

"The Irish Radicals replied, 'that they could not defend Mr. O'CONNELL's conduct on the factory question.'

"I then added, 'that I had always considered, that when Mr. O'CONNELL coalesced with the "bloody and brutal Whigs," he had bargained to support them on all their ministerial questions, when they were hard pushed; and as they felt themselves, without his aid, beaten on the factory question, they had reminded him of the contract, and that in defiance of all his solemn

pledges, they had demanded their bond. 'This,' I said, 'had been my impression, with regard to Mr. O'CONNELL's conduct on the Factory question, until my recent visit to Manchester, where I had seen Mr. CONDY, who was a Radical, a sterling friend of the working classes, and who was the personal friend and great supporter of Mr. O'CONNELL. That from him I had learned the following facts :—That previous to the late English Whig subscription for Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. O'CONNELL was in such embarrassed circumstances, that he must inevitably have retired from Parliament, unless funds could be raised to meet his engagements ; that, in consequence, his friends had applied to the Whigs, and that they had commenced an English subscription, for the sole purpose of enabling him to remain in Parliament ; and that Mr. POTTER had made a direct bargain with Mr. O'CONNELL that if he would support the mill owners on the Factory question, then ; that he, Mr. POTTER, would guarantee to Mr. O'CONNELL, £1,000 from Manchester.'

“ I expressed to Mr. CONDY, that in my opinion, Mr. O'CONNELL could not be driven from Parliament by poverty, and that I could hardly suppose he would be such a fool as to make a direct bargain for his vote.

“ Mr. CONDY assured me that what he had stated was the fact ; that seven hundred pounds had already been paid down, by Mr. POTTER, to Mr. O'CONNELL ; and that Mr. COSTELLOE, the Agent of Mr. O'CONNELL, (in whose company he, Mr. CONDY, had been) was at that very time in Manchester, for the purpose of looking after the remaining three hundred pounds.

“ Such was the statement I made, and I referred the parties, at the time, to Mr. CONDY, for the truth of that statement. I was not aware, as I before observed, that these circumstances would be published ; but, as they have been alluded to in the newspapers, - I deem it to be

my duty to the public, and to yourself, to furnish you with these particulars.

“ I am, dear Sir, your's sincerely,

“ RICHARD OASTLER.

“ Fixby, near Huddersfield.

“ P.S.—I must leave you and Mr. CONDY to settle whether or not you were justified in publishing the fact. Do you think you can ascertain how it happens, that the Roman Catholic Bishop should have recently ordered the Roman Catholic Priests, in the Manchester district, not to interfere in behalf of the poor of their flocks, who are factory slaves.

“ R. O.”

“ MR. O'CONNELL AND THE HUDDERSFIELD SHORT TIME COMMITTEE.

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE LONDON MERCURY.

“ SIR—The conduct of Mr. O'CONNELL in reference to the Factory question, being still of considerable interest to the public, the Short Time Committee of Huddersfield have ordered that a letter, which was sent from that body to Mr. O'CONNELL, immediately after his voting with Ministers, and against the children, should be now published in your paper.

“ The original cannot at present be found ; but it began by stating to Mr. O'CONNELL, that a good many of his countrymen belonged to our Association, and that when his strange conduct was pointed out to them, they endeavoured to excuse him by saying, ‘ that he had so much work on hand, that he could not possibly enter into the full merits of every subject.’ Taking this position, it was asked in the letter, ‘ if Mr. O'CONNELL did not sufficiently understand the factory question, on whom did he rely ?—on Mr. BAINES ?—Why not the rather on such as Messrs. WAKLEY, FIELDEN, and the other Radical members ?’—It was then pointed out to Mr. O'CONNELL

that the Ten Hours' Bill was one on which the operatives had set their hearts ; as was evinced by the long struggle which had been maintained by them ; by the fact that meetings of the largest description had been held, time after time, to an amazing extent ; that petitions, almost innumerable, had been sent to Parliament ; and, lastly, that the operatives were actually (at that time) supporting delegates in London, at an enormous expense, for the purpose of obtaining the Ten Hours' Bill. *This* was pointed out to Mr. O'CONNELL, as a mode of expression which ought not to be lost on one who took 'justice rent.' Mr. O'CONNELL was then argued with as a professed Radical, maintaining the right of the people to universal suffrage, and he was desired to tell us whether he disregarded the voice of the people, because they had not actually the suffrage—and how he could reconcile such conduct with his professions?

“ Mr. O'CONNELL has never thought it worth his while to reply to that letter—not a line. The aforesaid letter was signed by us, on behalf of the short time committee. We are sure of the general accuracy of this statement. Mr. O'CONNELL may, if he pleases, produce the original letter.

“ JOHN HANSON.

“ JOHN LEECH.

“ Huddersfield, October 17, 1836.”

To the charge of corruption against our illustrious countryman, we will make no reference—we treat it with indifference ;—the course which he himself most properly pursued. As regards the inconsistency of his conduct, we attribute it to a two fold cause—first, to an honest change of opinion on balancing, during the debate, the advantages and disadvantages of restraining the Mill-owners by a ten hours' Act ; and, secondly, a desire to sustain the Whig Government, so long as it evinced an

anxiety to do justice to Ireland. Mr. O'CONNELL has been charged with having called consistency 'rascally consistency.' Now what he meant by that expression was, that consistency in wrong—consistency, in spite of altered convictions, was culpable. He through life acted on this principle, and he was never ashamed to change his conduct, or acknowledge his error, when he was convinced he had committed one. In truth, his inconsistencies were caused by consistency of principle—the principle of endeavouring to be always right; and when going in a wrong direction, to lose no time in retrieving his steps—as, for example, his conduct respecting the "Wings," in 1825. By pursuing this course, he preserved his position; and his good sense and judgment were implicitly confided in by the people. It was this rule of action that influenced him on the Factory question. We don't say he took a correct view of the matter. However anxious we may have been to keep in the Government, which was so friendly to Ireland, that feeling would not influence us in reference to the Factory Bill—and however, persuaded we might be, that shortening the hours of labour would be injurious to the interests of the Manufacturers, we could never resist the demand of humanity, on behalf of the Factory children, whatever advantage it may for a time, have given to foreign competitors.

Mr. O'CONNELL on the 1st of November, 1837, at the General Association—thus explains the transaction, and, in our opinion, in a manner perfectly satisfactorily:—

"On the factory question, I am calumniated too, and I wish once for ever to set that business at rest. It was called a venal vote. Yes, Professor WILSON, to whose praises I see no end in the English papers, was the originator of that slander. At least it was in his paper it first appeared. He was editor of *Blackwood's Magazine*. I will now again contradict the base, un-

founded story, and state the case as it happened. It was stated that I got £1,000 for proposing that the bill should be discussed by a committee. The circumstances attending that bill were these :—It was brought in by Mr. POULETT THOMSON, merely to suspend the falling in of children, under the age of 13 years, within the eight years bill. I went down to vote against the bill. I heard it stated—and it was admitted that it was stated—that 25,000 children would be put out of employment if the bill passed, and this was confirmed by subsequent evidence, that at that age, so far from factory work being injurious to children, the number of deaths in the cotton factory, of children in this employment, is only one out of five to other trades in England, proving its salubrity. And again, Sir ROBERT PEEL carried my vote that night, for he pressed upon the ministers the appointment of inspectors for the protection of the factory children; Mr. P. THOMSON admitting four men were too few for that purpose, and promising, if the bill went into committee upon that account, to have the facts discussed. I acted upon that occasion merely for the advantage of the children; and would to God, children of 13 year's old in Ireland, could earn the money which the English factory children might have earned. The matter never went further.”

The following paragraph, which appeared in the newspapers of the day, may be taken as a summary of the calumnies propagated against O'CONNELL in 1836, and inserting it, we take leave of, for the present, the baseless slanders against his reputation :—

“ There is first, the RAPHAEL lie. It contained two distinct allegations of criminality. The one that Mr. O'CONNELL took a bribe for himself, to return a person for Carlow—the other that he applied money to corrupt others. Of both he was distinctly, unanimously, and

triumphantly exculpated, by a committee of the House of Commons, chiefly consisting of his political enemies. Have one of those *religious* persons who made a party use of these slanders, once come forward to express 'Christian' or any other kind of regret, for having disseminated such criminal accusations against him ?

" The next lie in our memory, is that in which he was confidently accused of having received five thousand pounds from Mr. MAHONY, to carry through the Drogheda rail-road bill. This was confidently stated. Now read the following extract from a late speech of Mr. MAHONY :—

" ' Amongst those slanders, it was his duty to tell them, and through them the public, of one in which he was personally involved—it was that he, as their instrument, gave O'CONNELL £5,000 for his services, in order to carry the bill through the House of Commons. To whomsoever put forth that slander, he would say, that he could not be called a gentleman, but a slanderer of the worst description. He said he owed it to that most eminent man to state, that he did not believe there was one existing more above the suspicion of entering into so base an arrangement; and after a confidential intercourse of nearly 25 years, he did not hesitate to avow that, upon Mr. O'CONNELL's honour, he placed the most entire reliance; and if the base slanderer of Mr. O'CONNELL and of him (Mr. MAHONY) would come forward, and avow that the letter was his, he (Mr. MAHONY) stood pledged to bring the case into a court of justice, where he would submit Mr. O'CONNELL for cross-examination relative to the transaction.'

" We need hardly tell our readers this gauntlet has not been taken up. It was a sound Tory lie—and a Tory, although he may re-assert a proved lie, never acknowledges it.

“ The next that strikes us is the *Bell* lie—he of the Radical humbug, for Tory objects. BELL's lie was, that Mr. O'CONNELL got a thousand pounds not to vote on the factory question. It had the mark of blundering falsehood, that is it was too circumstantial. He named Mr. POTTER as the giver—and here we have, in the speech of Mr. POTTER, his brother, that fabrication also disposed of. Mr. POTTER said—

“ My brother had no more to do with Mr. O'CONNELL on the factory question, or Mr. O'CONNELL with him, than any gentleman here present. It was a weak invention of the enemy—of the Tories ; and I do not regret that they made it, because it shows the desperate state to which they were reduced.’

“ We have alluded to these topics, to illustrate the lying propensities of Toryism in general, and against Mr. O'CONNELL in particular—that when the next batch are invented, the public may not wait for evidence, for they may decide by anticipation. Of this, at least, every man may be sure—that whenever a tale goes to inculpate Mr. O'CONNELL in any *money* fault, it is, on the face of it, a fabrication as improbable as it is unjust. Never did man stand purer from pecuniary selfishness than Mr. O'CONNELL. No man has ever thought less of money when the public cause required it. For twenty years previously to emancipation, the expenses of the struggle came out of his pocket. For twenty years *he*, (O'CONNELL) was ‘ *the Justice Rent of Ireland.*’ He neglected profitable business, often incurred pecuniary difficulties in the public cause. People at a distance may not be aware what sums still are extracted from him—a tax upon his political position. And although the gratitude and justice of the country has supplied him with means, which have prevented his pecuniary and professional sacrifices from being ruinous, still he made

the sacrifices before he knew they would have been so considered—when he might as well have been the victim of Tory vengeance as the idol of a grateful people.’

These attacks did not prevent Mr. O'CONNELL from seeking steadily for the great object of his existence—the regeneration of his Country. While at Darrynane, he continued to agitate, by means of the Newspaper Press. He addressed his Constituency, on the state of the national affairs—he wrote to the “General Association”, several letters upon the various subjects then pressing upon public attention. He addressed Mr. BAINES, of Leeds, on the Reform of the House of Lords. Mr. BAINES was opposed to the scheme, as impracticable, and, as matter of course, he and Mr. O'CONNELL came on that subject into personal collision—in those times, personalities in politics were not avoided. A better feeling is springing up at the present day. There is no longer the necessity for such collisions. Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD and he came into collision on the Tithe question. CRAWFORD was for total abolition, and no compromise. O'CONNELL was for getting all by degrees—by instalments. CRAWFORD was straightforward, unbending, honest, and somewhat stern in his views. O'CONNELL was guided by prudence, considering it the part of a good tactician, to yield at the proper moment. When he could not get all he wished—he took what he got, and then looked for more. In the management of details he was guided by expediency. In the assertion of principle he was unflinching. CRAWFORD was always unbending—O'CONNELL was always ready to grasp at a present benefit. He accepted, for instance, the Tithe Rent-charge, without the appropriation principle, because he was anxious to avoid the further spilling of blood. Had the contest continued longer—more lives would have been lost; but the Church-ascendency system would have been destroyed.

At present it is, as it were, rooted in the soil of Ireland as firmly as are the rights of private property. Such was the nature of the dispute between CRAWFORD and O'CONNELL. It is difficult to say which was right. On the renewed Coercion Act, to which O'CONNELL gave his consent, CRAWFORD and he came also into collision. CRAWFORD was opposed to its renewal. O'CONNELL consented to its renewal—so far as it went to restrain agrarian violence—and stript, as it was, of those unconstitutional enactments directed against political associations. O'CONNELL was, here again, anxious to save the people from the effects of their own violence—and protect the well-disposed from the despotism of the reckless. On principle, CRAWFORD was right; for within the constitution the refractory may, under ordinary circumstances, be well restrained. But in O'CONNELL'S opinion, there was sufficient social disorganization to justify the enactment of extraordinary laws. There was, however, the same reason existing in 1846—for PEEL'S Coercion Act—but then it was decreed that a new system in the Government of Ireland should be adopted. The rule for the future was to be justice and right, and not coercion and wrong. That should have been O'CONNELL'S policy in 1836. He should have gone beyond the system of the day. But Expediency came to him and whispered—For Ireland'S sake, support, in their endeavour to suppress agrarian outrage, a Government inclined to do you justice. SHARMAN CRAWFORD was influenced by no such motive, and therefore, on the abstract principle, he was right. The correspondence between these two eminent men, though very lengthy, will be read with interest by those who desire to become intimately acquainted with the minute transactions of these times, and with the specific motives which governed the acts of publicmen.

While these distinguished Irishmen were arguing on

the relative merits of immediate and total abolition, and of gradual and entire appropriation, the Tithe campaign was going on with increasing violence. The Writ of Rebellion was an awful instrument in the hands of the Rector. It was the easiest thing possible to take it out. The application was a matter of course, and subpoena or notice served on the parties. did not require personal service. If put under the outer door of the dwelling, the service was complete. When the writ was obtained, then the Constabulary force of the country was at the disposal of any "Rebellion ruffian," for such was the style and title conferred on these Commissioners by the people. Over the whole country, the unhappy warfare was carried on. The people were worn down by the oppression. It was this O'CONNELL felt, when he afterwards, in 1838, accepted the Tithe Rent-charge, stript of the appropriation principle. He was, as we will see, furiously attacked for it. But it is hard for any humane man to say whether, under the circumstances, he would not have done likewise.

O'CONNELL succeeded so well in overcoming the apathy of the people, that the "Justice Rent" increased towards the end of the year. Young Agitators had volunteered to visit the Provinces and stir up the people. They eminently succeeded. This success arose from the conviction, that the time was fast approaching when their own favorite question would be agitated, and when the flag of Repeal would be raised, never to be pulled down.

It was about this time that Mrs. O'CONNELL died, November, 1836. This estimable lady had been for a considerable time in very delicate health, and though it was evident she was gradually sinking, her death was not so soon expected. It was rather sudden. O'CONNELL was actually on his way to Dublin, when an express, with the

appalling intelligence, overtook him in Killarney. Mrs. O'CONNELL had been for a long time in a very nervous state, and we have seen on various occasions, during his journies with her to and from Dublin, how he declined processions, and other demonstrations of that nature, because of her delicate health. Mrs. O'CONNELL was remarkable for strong sense, and for a deep affection for her distinguished husband. Thus, in consequence, the unceasing attacks to which he was subject, and the constant logomachia in which he was engaged, were always to her a cause of uneasiness and pain. We have seen how she acted in the affair with PEEL. In other more trying circumstances, of a different character, she sustained and guided her illustrious partner.—Her affections were remarkable for feminine strength and fervour. Her intellect was of a masculine order, and good sense was its chief attribute. Mr. O'CONNELL was greatly attached to her, and to his death never ceased to lament his bereavement. The pledges of their affection were nine children. MAURICE, the inheritor of his estates. MORGAN, now Registrar of Deeds, and in 1836, member for the County of Meath. JOHN, M.P., for Kilkenny, the present political leader in Conciliation Hall—a gentleman of very considerable talent—great application, and ardently devoted to his country. DANIEL, M.P., for Waterford—his filial devotion to his father, during his last illness, will be for ever cherished in the memory of the Irish Nation. ELLEN, married to CHRISTOPHER FITZSIMMON, Esq., who in 1836, was member for the County of Dublin. KATE, married to CHARLES O'CONNELL, R.M., of Bohoss, County Kerry, an excellent country gentleman, and ELIZABETH, married to NICHOLAS FRENCH, Esq., of the County of Roscommon. MAURICE was in 1836, and is now M.P. for Tralee. At the general election of 1835, he

was the first Irish Member returned, and his father was proud of the circumstance. JOHN, entered Parliament for Youghal, and represented that town when Mrs. O'CONNELL died. He afterwards, as we shall see, was returned for Athlone, and is now member both for Limerick and Kilkenny.

The mortal remains of Mrs. O'CONNELL were deposited in the ruined Abbey of Darrynane, situate at the end of the demesne, and overhanging the Atlantic. Nothing now remains but mouldering walls of the onco Abbey of the Canons Regular of St. Austen, founded A.D. 637. Within the walls are graves and rude tomb-stones, and, as in every old country burial place, the human bones and skulls are heaped up in angles, or lying about bleaching in the air, with the winds from the Atlantic as their winding sheet. It was here Mrs. O'CONNELL was interred. Here, we always supposed, would be the last resting-place of Ireland's foremost patriot, for future generations to visit, as the shrine where were preserved all that was left on earth of the most remarkable man of his day.

The following is HOWITT's touching description of the Abbey:—

“ What a singular place is a rural burial place, in Ireland! With a strong feeling of the sanctity of the spot, they cling to those old ruins of Churches and Abbeys; yet how few traces are there of that neatness and external adornment of the cemetery, which seem to mark the affection of survivors for those who are gone! It is seldom that you find inscribed headstones, except of the rich. The common herd lie mingled in the common earth, with scarcely any distinguishment, but a rude stone, of perhaps a foot high, gathered on the spot, and set upright on the centre of the grave. The whole of

the interior of this ruin was filled with the dead, laid close as possible, side by side, and was consequently studded thickly with those short, rude, unhewn stones of memorial. This crowding into this roofless ruin, was owing to the feeling of the greater sanctity ; for without was limitless space, yet within there was but one grave, the Tomb of the O'CONNELL's, which had any inscription. Without, it was the same. I could but discover one stone, and that a flat one, with one inscription.— Every other evidence of the neatness which distinguishes an English grave yard, was wanting. The bones which had been dug out of the grave of yesterday, were laid on the next grave, and a few stones piled upon them—a faint trace—of the old habit of piling the cairn over the dead. The boards of the old coffin were thrown into a corner, where my companion assured me they would lie and rot. At the east end, where the high altar had been, a considerable quantity of disinterred bones were laid, and stones piled upon them ; and both within and without, amongst the long grass of the graves, lay about those unsightly boards of old disinterred coffins. It is, no doubt, the poverty of the common people, which has led them to retain the old habit of merely raising a rough stone in memory of the dead ; but it were to be wished that they studied a little more the decorous aspect of their burial-places, by interring again the bones, and burning the coffin boards.

“ In the south-west corner of the Abbey ruin, stands an object of interest to the visitor—the tomb of the O'CONNELLS. Here rests Mrs. O'CONNELL ; and here will, doubtless, one day rest the remains of the man who has made his name familiar throughout the world, for his exertions in behalf of his oppressed country. This is a

plain altar-tomb, set close into the corner; and on the western wall above it, a Gothic arch encloses an iron cross. On the tomb is inscribed—

DOM.

Erected to the Memory of

DANIEL O'CONNELL TOWNLEY, of Darrynane, Esq.,

Who departed this life 1770, full of years

and virtues.

Also of MARY, his wife, &c. Also of

MAURICE O'CONNELL, Esq.

Their son, who erected this monument. The chief ambition of his long and respected life, was to elevate an ancient family from unmerited oppression. His allegiance was pure and disinterested: his love of his native land, sincere and devoted. His attachment to the ancient faith of his fathers, and to the Church of Christ, was his first pride and his chiefest consolation. He died on the 10th of February, in the 95th year of his age. They loved him best who knew him most. May his soul rest in eternal peace!

“This date, Mr. O'CONNELL assured me, should be ninety-seven. Why the old gentleman, at the latter end of his life, persisted in depriving himself of two of his years, never could be understood.”

O'CONNELL, in a few days after the funeral, left Darrynane for Dublin, and on Thursday, the tenth of November, appeared at the National Association. When he rose to speak he was deeply affected, and remained silent for a few moments, while the whole meeting greeted him with a loud and hearty cheer, in which they permitted their recollection of his sorrow to be carried away by their joy at beholding him again among them. After the cheering had subsided, he said:—

“I rose this morning with a determination to devote every moment of the rest of my existence to the cause of my country. I consider I have as yet done nothing, while so much re-

mains to be done, and I trust I will not sink into the grave, which has now no terrors for me, till I see my country happy, and her injuries avenged by liberty. I am here once more to call for justice for my country, and to sound the peaceful tocsin of her political resurrection, and my words, perhaps, will be resounded in her green and fertile vallies, reverberated on the summit of her lofty mountains and through her fair fields, proclaiming that I have said to the people :—‘Awake, arise, or be for ever fallen!’ I despise the man who can now be calm—I despise the man who can now feel torpid, or insensible to the wrongs he has been made to suffer. I loathe the wretch who does not feel called upon to make an effort for the regeneration of his country. I am accused of calling on my imagination for causes of complaint, and grievance, but our enemies furnish us with them only too fast. What! has not **LYNDHURST** declared us aliens from the subjects of the same crown, and has not he been borne out by the House of Peers, who denied us justice, and branded us as unworthy of civil liberty? And the Conservatives, too, at their meetings and dinners; hear the language they apply to Ireland, and everything that is Irish. What is the Conservative cry?—They do me the honour to cry ‘Down with **O’CONNELL.**’ Now that is quite right. What am I? A reed shaken by the breeze—a straw that marks how the wind blows, or rather a floating feather that serves to show the course of the current. I am but a name that they would not condescend to mention, if they did not think I was identified with the cause of Ireland. I am complimented by their attention, and indeed my vanity ought to be excited by their constant reference to me; but for anger, or any painful feeling, it is out of the question—In fact, I am pleased at the terrors of their tongues, and grow proud of their slanders, for I read in

them the history of my services to my country, and look upon their abuse as my richest reward."

He continued, in a strain of great eloquence, for over an hour. At the close of the meeting, "the Justice Rent" for the week was announced to reach SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-THREE POUNDS. On the next day, he had another meeting of the Association, besides a meeting of the Trades' Union, where he made a very powerful speech, and concluded by moving "the appointment of a Committee to wait on Lord MORPETH, to ascertain what the Government intended to do on the subject of Poor Laws."

In two days after he had another meeting of the Association. On the following day, another, at which he and SHARMAN CRAWFORD were pitted, in argument, against each other, on the subject of Tithes. On the 21st November, he attended another great meeting at the Trades' Union, and at the General Association. On the 24th November, he and SHARMAN CRAWFORD had another debate on Tithes and "Rebellion Ruffians." On the first, the fifth, the eighth, the fourteenth, and the twenty-ninth of December, he attended meetings of the General Association, and the Trades' Union, in Dublin, and most urgently and eloquently agitated at each of them. On the nineteenth of December, he was entertained at a splendid public banquet by the Town of Drogheda. His speech, in returning thanks for his health, was animated, bold, defiant. It reminds us of his Mallow speech, in 1843. The following are the concluding sentences of this masterly appeal:—

"But I am making an experiment to obtain justice from England without that alternative, and 'till it is fully worked out, I cannot think of falling back upon my favourite measure of relief. Let this experiment be

one of five years' duration, as well as the other. Two are already passed; and when the others have terminated, if we see that England does not give us justice, we must take it for ourselves. I make the experiment fairly and honestly, and without any shade of chicanery. I will take the fullest means, and use my best efforts to make it successful, and if we get justice it is all we seek; but if we fail in the experiment, then shall we demand the power of legislating for ourselves. I call upon the people to support the King's Ministers, who have promised us justice—we should be untiring in our efforts to enable them to fulfil that promise, or the fault of the failure will be ours. Lay aside your wishes for Repeal, but do not lay aside your efforts for justice—let the good men of England see that while you have assisted them, and all who sought justice, to obtain it, you will not consent to be deprived of it yourselves. If you want any incentive to activity, remember that you have been insulted—grossly insulted. Tho' Jacobin in his youth, and the slave in his old age—the sycophant of all parties, who was true to none—LYNDHURST, has brought the shame upon you of bearing calm and deliberate insult. He has called you aliens in your native land, and branded you as unfit for liberty. Is there a man listening to me who would not rather permit his heart's blood to flow out than have that stigma cast up to his children? Injury it would be hard to suffer, but insult!—insult is intolerable—Our land is not the birth-place of slaves, and we will not bear the foul indignity—I never retire to my solitary pillow, without the determination to make one more effort for my country. At my time of life, I am falling into the sere and yellow leaf; but my heart is young, and I believe my arm, if I found it necessary to use it, is still sufficiently powerful. Why do I, whose life has been spent as a disciple of peace, preach-

ing that no alteration in government can be good, if brought about by force, and that one drop of human blood would be too dear a purchase for any victory, talk of physical power? Irishmen, because we have been insulted. I would rather see your river again red with Irish blood, than that we should be degraded and insulted. We might submit to the destruction of our property, and the danger of our lives, to the ferocity of the ruffian soldier, and the heartless camp follower. In all these, and a thousand other shapes, injury was heaped upon us, and we bore it, and perhaps would again, but we will never consent to submit to insult. They would fling shame upon us; but I tell you, you must not dare to be a party to it. Why do I say dare? If you were dastardly enough to do so, I would turn round to those (pointing to the ladies) who would not submit to insult, nor look upon the man who would. Those, without whom your lives would have no blessing, without whom you could not live, and I tell you again you would not dare to put up with insult. No, you would not bear contumely—you have declared it; and your determination will go to the world on the wings of the press, telling them that anything is tolerable but insult. In this industrious and intelligent town, it will be seen what is the opinion of the contumely thrown on our country; Ireland will rejoice in your sentiments, and the press will tell the whole British empire that it is not safe for England to be a party to the insult.—Chains of adamant, and the force of the Russian empire would not be sufficient to bind us under insult; it must then be wiped off, or else——”

Thus did the LIBERATOR keep up the agitation, and prepare the people for the coming Parliamentary Session, when they had once again to enter into conflict with the House of Lords. Thus did he endeavour to sustain the Government, against the power of these hereditary legis-

lators, notwithstanding the miserable majority of TWENTY-FIVE which they had in the House of Commons. The battle cry was "the Whigs, and justice for Ireland," and most powerfully, at the critical moment, did it support and cheer them on.

Mr. O'CONNELL was, during his stay in Dublin, employed in a most important writ of rebellion case before the Court of Exchequer, where O'LOUGHLIN now presided as Chief Baron. He made, as the Chief Baron expressed it, a most able legal argument, and succeeded, in a great degree, in shaking the opinion of the Judges on the legality of their proceedings in regard to the issuing of these tremendous instruments of the Law—writs of rebellion. It was considered, by the most eminent men at the bar, as one of the best arguments ever made on so abstruse a question of law, in a court of Justice. It was the general topic of conversation, at the time, in legal circles in Dublin.

About this time, the Agricultural Bank stopped payment—and there was, in consequence, a run on all the Joint Stock Banking Companies in Ireland. Amongst others, the National Bank was severely tried, but it rode out the storm gallantly. When the run ceased, Mr. O'CONNELL, as Governor of the Bank, addressed to "the people of Ireland," the following letter:—

" TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

" National Bank of Ireland, Office, Dame-street,

" Dublin, 22d Nov., 1836.

" Whilst the run for gold continued on the National Bank, of which I am Governor, I was often asked by friendly persons, unconnected in interest with our establishment, to use the influence, which the people of Ireland allow me to possess, to put a stop to the unwise demand for gold in lieu of National notes. I refused to do so—I refused to interfere—until the demand should have

ceased, and until the National Bank had practically proved its readiness and punctuality, by paying every demand made upon it.

“ I did, indeed, think that the people of Ireland ought, of themselves, to have shown that confidence in me, and to have testified their conviction that I would not be one to circulate amongst them any paper which could cause any loss or injury to anybody ; but I would not complain, nor do I now complain—I am only grieved that the people should injure themselves, by striking down prices ; and should deprive the farmers of good markets, and take away from almost everybody the means of giving employment to the labourer and to the poor.

“ The three last years were years of low prices, and of great difficulty for the industrious classes to pay their rents, and sustain the heavy burdens which pressed upon them. This season, on the contrary, opened well ; there was a remunerating price for everything, when a foolish panic seized a number of persons, and they, most senselessly, and culpably, made a run on the banks. It did, indeed, afflict me much to see the people thus injure themselves.

“ It also grieved me to see that the Irish people—intelligent though they be—did not understand the security against any ultimate loss, which arises from the constitution of a joint stock bank, where every shareholder is liable to the full extent of all his property. Every bank note is in the nature of a judgment debt, and binds all the real property of the shareholder. This, I tell you as a lawyer, and pledge my professional credit thereupon.

“ For example—the Agricultural Bank—has ceased to pay its notes with banking regularity. I am sincerely sorry for it—it was kind and useful to the farmers and traders. I have no sort of connexion whatsoever with

that Bank, or with the respectable class of persons who are its shareholders ; but I am bound to tell the people, that I am perfectly convinced that every single note of that establishment will be ultimately paid in full ; and I declare it my opinion that no man should part with an Agricultural note for less than its full value.

“ I have, I repeat, no connexion with the Agricultural Bank, neither have I with the Provincial Bank ; but I know that the Provincial Bank is a very wealthy establishment. I know its shareholders in London are extremely opulent ; I know that the people are perfectly safe in taking and in keeping the Provincial notes ; and that it is folly, and, in fact, great wickedness to make any run on that Bank ; because it would interfere with its directors in their readiness to accommodate the farmers, merchants, and traders, and thus keep down prices, and prevent trade and employment.

“ I say these things of the Provincial Bank, without having had, directly or indirectly, any communication with any person connected with that establishment. It really is so solvent an establishment, that its shareholders may perhaps be displeased at my seeming to uphold their credit. They mistake me : it is not for their sakes ; it is for the sake of the People of Ireland that I write—it is to warn the people against being their own enemies, by preventing the Provincial Bank from discounting bills, and advancing money to the industrious classes of society.

“ With respect to the Bank of Ireland—the Government Bank—I beg leave respectfully to thank their directors for the liberality with which they have come forward to sustain public credit. I do not know of greater madness than that of the people who made a run for gold on some of the branches of the National Bank—it was sheer insanity—again striking down the prices of their

own commodities, and taking away the means of employment.

“ It is not merely as Governor of the National Bank of Ireland—it is as one—alas !—of the oldest and steadiest friends of Ireland, that I address you. As the friend of the people, I call on them to allow the Banks to do them good.

“ I instituted the National Bank merely to do good to the people of Ireland—I call on them to assist me to serve themselves. Every shilling of property I have in the world—all the property of my eldest son and his family—all the property of my son-in-law, is involved as security for the notes of the National Bank, together with the property of all other shareholders. The run has ceased—the demand is over—I now only ask the people to return to the tranquil enjoyment of those advantages which I sought to secure to them by establishing the National Bank of Ireland.

“ I cannot conclude without candidly confessing, that several Conservative landlords have come forward to sustain public credit, and have sunk all considerations of angry politics, in order to do public good. This is a kind and right feeling, which ought to be cultivated and encouraged at every side and by every body.

“ I think I deserve the confidence of the People ; I call on them to confide in me and to follow my advice.—No man can be injured by doing so. Every man will be the better for taking the advice, in this instance, of

“ Your devoted friend,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL,

“ Governor of the National Bank of Ireland.”

Does not the reader think, from what we have been detailing of his active career in 1836, that he had ample occupation on his hands. Yes, and it is incredible how he accomplished all? Yet we cannot conclude the his-

tory of the time, without noticing that he was this year publicly announced as one of the joint Editors, with Dr. WISEMAN and Mr. M. QUIN, of the *Dublin Review*, a periodical, at that time, and for years subsequently, conducted with eminent talent and good learning. The polemical articles, from the pen of Dr. WISEMAN, are worthy of the highest place in contemporary literature, both for their deep learning and for his masterly style in treating of such abstruse subjects. The political and literary articles maintained well the distinguished character which Ireland's cherished *Review* had acquired. It is said that one of the most agreeable contributors to it was one of Mr. O'CONNELL's accomplished daughters—a lady of a very high order of intellect, refined taste, and of extensive literary acquirements. Not being aware how such a notice may be received, we refrain from pointing more accurately to whom, as a constant contributor to our national review, the Irish public is so much indebted. The following statement, which appeared in the *Tablet* newspaper, will explain some further particulars in reference to Mr. O'CONNELL's connexion with the *Dublin Review* :—

“ We have long known, on the authority of more than one respectable gentleman, that Mr. O'CONNELL, to free the *Review* from embarrassment, did advance other sums than those charged in the regular balance-sheet of the *Review*. In order, however, not to trust to our own memory in the matter, we, at once, made application to a gentleman, who was mixed up with the affairs of this periodical, at the time of its being started—we mean Mr. ANSTAY—and at our request he has put down in writing the following statement of circumstances :—

* The sole conductor of the *Dublin Review*, down to October, 1836, was the late Mr. QUIN, who was one of the proprietors. Some time in that month, I happened accidentally, to meet him on my way from the Newcastle

steam packet, which had just landed me at Blackwall. He took me aside, and informed me, that, having received a lucrative appointment in Cuba, he was under the necessity of abandoning his engagements with the *Review* so abruptly, that unless somebody undertook it on the spot, the next number would not keep its time. He begged me to do it; and he informed me, in answer to my objections, that there would be no pecuniary demand, and that the greater part of the matter was already in type; and for the rest he recommended subjects. I then consented; and he promised, if I called upon him the next day, to put me more in the way of it. I then went to Mr. BAGSHAWE, who, as I understood, held a general power of attorney for Dr. WISEMAN, another proprietor, who was then in Rome; and I gave him a full account of all that Mr. QUIN had told me, which surprised him much, as until then he had not heard anything of that gentleman's Cuba project. He consented to act with me, when instructions could be got from Dr. WISEMAN, and from Mr. O'CONNELL, the remaining proprietor. Next morning, I saw Mr. QUIN, who completed his instructions to me, and these I reported to Mr. BAGSHAWE. It was then agreed that in case the funds at our disposal permitted the continuance of the *Review*, one of us should write to the Rev. PATRICK TIERNEY, of Arundel, soliciting him to act as editor of the third number; and, in that view, it was also agreed that measures should be taken to raise a supplemental fund by voluntary contributions, and that gentleman should be invited to meet us. Several meetings took place accordingly, both at Mr. LYNCH's and at Mr. BAGSHAWE's chambers, and at one or two of them, Mr. GARDOM attended as Mr. QUIN's solicitor. Accordingly money began to be collected. Mr. SPOONER, who had published o. II., was Napped to; and he consented to bring out No. III., at his own immediate cost, if he were pro-

perly indemnified. Mr. O'CONNELL, to whom these various proceedings had been regularly communicated, wrote to Mr. BAGSHAWE, approving most warmly of all that had been done, and undertaking to give Mr. SPOONER the indemnity he sought. I remember that Mr. SPOONER expressed himself, at a meeting at Mr. LYNCH's chambers, perfectly satisfied with that letter, and acted upon it without hesitation ever afterwards. I also remember, that in the same or another letter, also read by Mr. BAGSHAWE at Mr. LYNCH's chambers, Mr. O'CONNELL gave Mr. BAGSHAWE full authority to draw upon him, to an amount, limited only by the deficiency in the funds, which should render such an application necessary. He said that as to using his name, *that he left Mr. BAGSHAWE's discretion.* If he thought it advantageous to use it, let him do so. If, which was probable, the use of the name would prejudice the *Review* with English Catholics, let him keep it back. *But, whether Mr. O'CONNELL'S name was, or was not any longer to be connected with the Review, Mr. BAGSHAWE was, nevertheless, to draw upon him to the full amount of any deficiency.* I remember that Mr. BAGSHAWE, at the time, spoke very much of this generous and disinterested conduct of the *LIBERATOR*, and that many persons were influenced by it—as to their own subscriptions. If, on the face of the *Review* accounts, in the possession of the present 'conductors,' only £380 appear to have been actually drawn for by Mr. BAGSHAWE, *that only shows that he found it unnecessary to avail himself, to any larger extent, of Mr. O'CONNELL'S noble offer.* On the subject of those accounts, I have no personal knowledge; having almost, immediately after the date of Mr. O'CONNELL'S letter, abandoned my undertaking to Mr. QUIN, from the impossibility of performing it. Mr. BAGSHAWE thenceforward acted alone, and in the names of Dr. WISEMAN, and Mr.

O'CONNELL. The third number was brought out by Mr. TIERNEY, under Mr. BAGSHAWE's auspices.

'A permanent arrangement was then discussed, among the friends and supporters of the *Review*, and at last effected. At the meeting which took place, I attended amongst others. I remember that a good deal of difficulty as to the arrangement was caused by Mr. QUIN's sudden abandonment of his Cuba scheme, and his determination to retain his rights as co-proprietor in the *Review*. The subscribers in general, (although Lord BEAUMONT and some other gentlemen were on his side) seemed averse to his resuming the editorship; and accordingly that devolved at first on Mr. SMITH, (now of the Catholic Institute), and ultimately on Mr. BAGSHAWE. But his right, as proprietor, was a very different thing. It did not depend upon any one but Mr. QUIN himself, to say, whether he should or should not retain that. He set a high value upon his share in the *Review*, as well as upon his literary contributions to the two first numbers, which, it seems, had not been paid for, at least some of them. I think I remember his claims to have been often stated to me, by himself, at more than £1,000. However that may be, he afterwards comprised the matter with Mr. O'CONNELL. I remember being informed by Mr. BAGSHAWE at the time, that 'Mr. O'CONNELL had behaved very generously, and had made it worth QUIN's while to retire from the proprietorship.' This was confirmed soon afterwards by Mr. O'CONNELL himself. I never heard it doubted by any one until last year.

"It is pretty clear that, whatever may have been the amount which Mr. O'CONNELL paid Mr. QUIN, this last transaction was a private one, and therefore not very likely to appear upon the face of the *Dublin Review* accounts. Thus, it may be quite true that these disclose that a sum of £380 in all, was received from Mr.

O'CONNELL, by his publishers and conductors; while, at the same time, *much more* may have been received from him by Mr. QUIN and other people."

The energy and activity with which Mr. O'CONNELL carried on the agitation at the close of 1836, he continued vigorously at the beginning of 1837, and before the meeting of Parliament. At least, once a week, the general Association met, and, of course, he was the *Magnus Apollo* of every meeting. There were, however, unpleasant drawbacks in these discussions. It was, to the Irish nation, a painful thing, to see him and SHARMAN CRAWFORD in personal collision. CRAWFORD may be too unbending to circumstances, and may too sternly repudiate the doctrine of expediency; but of his honor and high political integrity, there never was a question. The people always had, and have a high opinion of him, and though they rallied in all cases round their tried and faithful leader—they regretted to see any difference between him and SHARMAN CRAWFORD. Besides in the abstract, CRAWFORD was right in the opinions he maintained at the General Association in 1837. He was in favour of the Total Abolition of Tithes, and of allowing the Church of England to maintain itself under the Voluntary system. On that ground, he was opposed to the Ministerial Tithe Bill, and laughed at the paltry Appropriation Clause; which, after all, was the only difference between the Tories and the Whigs. Mr. O'CONNELL, on the other hand, sustained the Government in this measure, because, by doing so, he kept in power a Ministry favorable to Ireland, and kept out of power a party that would have filled the judgment seat with partizans; and next, because the Appropriation Clause was an instalment of the principle maintained by SHARMAN CRAWFORD, which, if carried, as it was likely to be, would be in-

serting the wedge, by which the whole system would, in time, be broken; whereas, by holding aloof from the Government, because they did not go the whole way, nothing would be done, and the hereditary enemies of Ireland would be speedily carried into power. There can be no doubt that, as a practical Statesman, O'CONNELL was right to take every instalment offered, provided doing so ensured the obtaining of the remainder. If the Appropriation Clause were carried, undoubtedly it would have been an instalment that must have led to larger concessions. But it so happens that that clause, on which the Whigs came into power, was, by them, ultimately abandoned, and, in point of fact, as we have before said, Church property, for Church purposes, is better secured, now, than even private property. It is the first charge on the land. It comes before the rent. The people are not brought into collision with the Protestant Rector, and, consequently, there is as little likelihood of an agitation against the payment of his charge, as against the rent itself. Consequently, it is now doubtful, whether it would not have been better to have agitated, in 1837, for total abolition—or rather for the conversion of the Church property, after the death of the present incumbents, into a fund in aid of the Poor Law Rate. If such an agitation were rigorously carried on, we are disposed to think, that the landlords would have ultimately joined it, and that more good, than was done, would have been effected. At all events, it was clear, that there was no just cause of quarrel in the different views of Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. CRAWFORD, and thus while reading the proceedings of the National Association, in January, 1837, we are forced to lament, that an impatience of opposition often led O'CONNELL to use hasty language towards men of deserved popularity; language which he speedily forgot,

but which was remembered by those attacked, and operated to the disadvantage to the country. On the subject of Poor Laws, Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. CRAWFORD also came into collision. At the General Association, there occurred a most important discussion on this subject. The Rev. Mr. O'MALLEY introduced a motion in favor of Poor Houses, in a very powerful speech. It was a subject that required to be treated of with great calmness and close argument. In developing his views, the speaker should have been allowed to go on without interruption, so that he might not lose the train of his ideas. Now in this discussion Mr. O'CONNELL exhibited much impatience—interrupting Mr. O'MALLEY constantly—entering into explanations, in the middle of the Rev. gentleman's speech, and showing considerable irritability, when called to order. These, though apparently trifles, were very injurious to the cause of free discussion, which is the proudest attribute of liberty. This opposition, *in public*, is a trait in the character of our great countryman, which could not be passed over.

It was at this period he addressed the electors of Limerick against SMITH O'BRIEN, for maintaining the opinion that the Catholic clergy should be paid by the State—and for not supporting the ballot. As regards the first, it was then but a mere speculative opinion—based upon no tangible proposition, except the appropriation of the Church revenues—and, in respect to their appropriation to the payment of the clergy of all persuasions, free from state control—men might fairly differ. As regards the second—the ballot,—it was not an Irish question, and it is a matter of doubt, whether it would serve the popular cause in Ireland—now, particularly, when the days of landlord persecution are past. At all events, it is a subject, on which two steadfast patriots may differ—**We cannot therefore approve of O'CONNELL'S attack on**

SMITH O'BRIEN in 1837. He took up his views honestly, and, being of an earnest and sturdy disposition, he acted on them independently of parliamentary parties. In that respect, he resembled, in some particulars, Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD.

Mr. SMITH O'BRIEN'S reply is written with that perspicuity and strength, for which his written language is remarkable.—He appears to have defended his opinions with talent, moderation, and judgment. These personal collisions with known friends of popular rights, were undoubtedly to be deplored—for unquestionably, no cause can ever be strong, that is not based upon union.

While those altercations were going on amongst the liberal party, the Tories were banded together as one man—they held an enormous meeting at the Mansion-house, in Dublin. It was called together by a requisition of eight noblemen. The object of this great gathering, at which were twenty peers and sixteen members of parliament, was to wrest the encroachments of the popular party, and to organise a fierce opposition to the Government. Lord GLENGALL told the assembled Protestants, that “if they did not win the battle, which they were fighting—under the banners of the Duke, the days during which they could hold their Protestant estates were numbered.”

The Orange enthusiasm displayed at the meeting, was unprecedented. Lord RODEN was fugleman on the occasion. On his appearance with a purple and orange handkerchief, a thousand of the same colour were instantly waved in the air, amidst cheering and Kentish fire. Nothing could surpass the determination and bitterness of the speakers. So important was this meeting considered, as a party move, that a protest, against its being denominated a meeting of the Protestants of Ireland, was signed

by thirty-four Peers, and fifty-seven members of the House of Commons. It was evident that, in the approaching session of Parliament, the struggle of parties would be obstinate. It was on this account that O'CONNELL was so anxious in his support of the Whigs—it was for this, that he rather roughly handled those of popular tendencies, who took an opposite view, of the policy which the Irish liberals should adopt. He was sustained enthusiastically by the people, in the course he pursued—namely, in sustaining the Government against the violent attacks to which they were subjected by reason of their measures, however meagre and inadequate. In testimony of their feelings towards him, the people of Carlow, of Castlebar, of Kilkenny, entertained him at public dinners, and the entire nation cheered him on in his opposition to the Orange aristocracy, that had now assumed so formidable and defiant an attitude. The dinner at Carlow, was afterwards made remarkable, by a statement made by Captain VIGNOLLES, of the Constabulary, and by two officers of the 71st regiment—to the effect that, during Mr. O'CONNELL's speech, in returning thanks, he made use of the following expressions:—

“Men of Carlow, are you ready? I am the last man to recommend the shedding of one drop of blood; but we have tried every means of attaining our just rights, and they have failed. We have no course left now, but that which I have hitherto deprecated—the shedding of blood; *blood must be shed.*”

Mr. O'CONNELL solemnly, at the table of the House of Commons, denied ever having used language bearing the above import. Several of those who were present corroborated his assertion. It is clear, that putting the folly and madness of such observations out of the question, they were in direct contradiction to the careful

policy he had adopted. They were at variance with the support he was giving the Government, and with the experiment he was then engaged in making, on the justice of England. He was at war with the House of Lords, because of the denial to Ireland of her municipal rights, and not with the Whig administration. Such language, while endangering his own personal safety, would be embarrassing to those he then sustained, and would be surely made, as the statement was made, an instrument in the hands of his and their enemies.

Independently, then, of Mr. O'CONNELL's denial of having used the language imputed to him, we, on the face of the transaction, see sufficient to cause us to reject the statement—and to believe that the persons, who ascribed the words used, mistook the phraseology employed by Mr. O'CONNELL, and its import. He spoke under excitement, and used strong language; but the sentiment set forth in the above extract was never uttered by him.

The meetings in Ireland, at both sides, were preparatory to the coming Parliamentary struggle. It was to be, with the Tories, a life and death one; and with the people, a determined one. The National Association had now assumed a formidable position. Lord MELBOURNE even joined in the Tory apprehensions as regarded it.—It was become too powerful for the Minister to patronise. One-third of its members were Protestants. It was in truth a "National Association," representing as it did the entire people of Ireland. It was an Association that told plainly, to Lord LYNDBURST and his followers, it was dangerous any longer to insult a nation or resist its demand for justice. Against so formidable a confederacy, it was thought advisable to organise a counteracting force, and the Orange meeting in Dublin, was the result. Thus were pitted against each other, the Irish people, and the English Aristocracy, backed by

all the influence of Orange land. Both parties waited with impatience the meeting of Parliament.— It assembled on the 31st of January. It was opened by a speech by the Lords Commissioners. The speech recommended to Parliament the state of Ireland; and in reference thereto, recommended Municipal Reform, Church Reform, and Poor Laws, to its earnest attention. These three subjects occupied much of the Session. The party battle was fought upon the two first. Within a few days after the assembling of Parliament, Lord JOHN RUSSELL brought forward the Irish Municipal Reform Bill, and forthwith the struggle commenced. Last year the Bill was introduced by the Irish Attorney-General. This year it assumed more of an Imperial question; and the task was undertaken by the leader of the House of Commons. Last year, it was simply necessary to set forth the defects of the old Corporations, and the remedies which were proposed, and the provisions by which these remedies were to be obtained. This year, it was altogether a great party question. The entire Irish question was the subject of debate, and to lead the van, became the duty of Lord JOHN RUSSELL. Nobly and proudly did he accomplish it. His speech was one of his best and happiest efforts. His is a mind well stored with political knowledge. The love of the British Constitution, and of civil and religious liberty, is, as it were, in his distinguished house, a family heir-loom. He is, too, what SIDNEY SMITH described him, a bold and fearless Statesman—and he has this great advantage over Sir ROBERT PEEL, and STANLEY, and BROUGHAM, and GRAHAM, and PALMERSTON, and MELBOURNE. He has been steadily consistent with the principles in which he has been educated. In addition to all these advantages, for a Party Leader, Lord JOHN RUSSELL is an

erator of no ordinary standard. At the beginning of his address, before he warms to his work—he is, as Fox was, hesitating and scarcely intelligible. But after he receives the first cheer from his party, then his spirit rises; his language, which is that of a scholar, flows smoothly. Then he pours forth in rapid succession, maxims of political wisdom and profound principles, connected with popular rights. The philosophy, with which his patriotism is invested, adds a charm to his eloquence—which is still more enhanced by the earnestness of his delivery—and the classic purity of his diction. It is not possible to over-estimate the respect in which, in the House of Commons, he is held. His veneration for the Constitution, makes him be too apprehensive of change—and, though he will readily amend, he is not easily induced to sanction organic change. This over caution may suit very well the times of which we now write, when the struggle was to repair what was disorganised, and to break through a political monopoly which was inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution. We are advancing fast to a period, when the doctrine of “Finality,” will not be admitted in politics, and when the “greatest happiness” principle, in its onward course, will insist on organic change, if necessary for the amelioration of the human condition. But in 1836, political progress had not advanced far beyond Lord JOHN RUSSELL's opinion, and he was then looked upon as the Leader of Reform. In that capacity, he brought forward the Irish Municipal Bill. His speech, we have said, was one of his happiest efforts.

He was replied to by Sergeant JACKSON, in a strain of invective, worthy of his former position, as Secretary of the Kildare Street Society—worthy of the meeting at the Mansion House, whose sentiments he represented—worthy of the principles he expressed. In the course of

his invective, he attacked Mr. PIGOTT, because, while he was adviser at the Castle, he at the same time was a member of the National Association. This indirect alliance between the Corn Exchange and the Castle, shocked the intollerants, and, accordingly, Mr. JACKSON undertook to asperse the character of one of the purest and most high-principled men, that ever figured in the political arena, or ever adorned the Bench. This attack was not allowed to pass without a reprimand from O'CONNELL, who was the next speaker. "Pigott," said O'CONNELL, "was one of the most rising men at the Irish bar—his income was twice as much as that of any man of his standing. His legal knowledge was confessed to be of the highest order—and he was a man whose mental acquirements were so bemixed up with the milk of human kindness, that he did not think that there could be a human being found—except the learned Sergeant—to say a word against him. To do so, would require that species of heart, which was close to the leathern lungs of the learned Sergeant." "Leathern lungs," became, afterwards, the soubriquet of the learned Sergeant.

Sir ROBERT PEEL's opposition, this year, to Municipal Reform in Ireland, was based upon anxiety for the Church Establishment. Thus, for the purpose of upholding an acknowledged abuse, did he endeavour to deprive the Irish nation of that control over their own municipal affairs which was already given to both England and Scotland. Yet this is the man that we must kneel to and worship, because he had, in 1845, the foresight to import one hundred thousand pounds worth of Indian Meal into Ireland, at a time when, owing to the duty to which it was subject, and the prevailing prejudice against it, as an article for human food, no private individual would think of such importation.—

Before the people consent to accept him, in preference to their former friends, they should read his history.— Now-a-days, the wisest plan for the people and their Leaders would be, to keep aloof from both.

On the motion for going into Committee on this Bill, Lord F. EGERTON moved, as an instruction to the Committee, that the Corporations should be abolished—that is, he admitted a change was necessary—but he said his party demanded annihilation rather than amendment. It was a similar motion to the one he made on the collision between both houses, last year, and the consequent agitation for a reform in the Lords did not at all intimidate the Tories—the truth is, they felt their strength—They knew the state of the Constituencies. The fifty-pounds tenants at will—the free men, long purses, and English religious prejudices, made them feel very independent of the majority in the Commons. This debate was even more animated than the last. It continued two nights—and the leading men at both sides took part in it. But the crowning speech during the entire Session, was SHEIL'S—probably it was the best he ever delivered in Parliament. Circumstances aided him. Lord LYNDEHURST was under the gallery listening to the debate, and the opportunity was not allowed to pass, for expressing in his presence, the indignation of the people of Ireland, at the insult of that nobleman, when he called them aliens in blood, in language, and in religion. The effect produced was unprecedented in the annals of the House of Commons.

The whole passage to which we refer is so exquisitely finished, that we cannot refuse the reader the gratification which its perusal must afford. We give it entire:—

“What is our cause?” he said; “I will tell you what our cause is. You took from us a Parliament. If you left us our Parliament, there would have existed, in Ire-

land, the same dominion over that Parliament as the British people have over theirs. But you bought our House of Commons, and you paid for it in gold; aye, gold in its most palpable shape. You affected to league with us; and the head of the administration of the time, the great Minister of the day, by his classical references, elucidated and illustrated that great unnational compact. Twenty-nine years had passed, before this house took a single step for carrying that contract into effect. At length Emancipation was forced from you, Parliamentary Reform came next, and Corporation Reform was given to England; and now, when we ask you for the same privileges which you exercise yourselves, you refuse them. Yes, that which you had not dared to refuse to the people of England, you have contemptuously denied to the people of Ireland. Is this justice? Oh, but there is an anxiety to do us justice. This is the language that has been always used, ever since STRONGBOW first put his foot on the shores of Ireland. Yes, every Englishman, to whom the Government of Ireland has been committed, professed the utmost solicitude to do justice. Even STRAFFORD, the deserter of the people's cause—the renegade WENTWORTH, while setting his foot on the necks of Irishmen, declared his anxiety to do justice. I am not surprised at this, for the same influence now exists by which STRAFFORD was influenced. But while all others professed to do justice, there is one amongst you of the most distinguished talents, and the most decided character. He is not a member of this house—but he spoke at least with more frankness than others of his party. He does not profess to do justice to Ireland; he is above imposture, and part of the epitaph on *Charters* is applicable to him. This distinguished person tells us, when making an appeal to the passions of the English people, he tells us—the people of Ireland—that in every particular, by which strangers

can be numerated, we are aliens to this country. (Tremendous cheering, which lasted for five minutes, and was renewed with bursts of enthusiasm. Lord LYNDBURST was sitting under the gallery.) The phrase is certainly a remarkable one, and one which now belongs to history. It was one which must necessarily be the subject of observation hereafter. I am not aware whether that phrase has ever been attempted to be explained. I know the phrase has never been distinctly disavowed. I know that the utterance of that phrase has not been denied; and with respect to the meaning of it, but little doubt can be entertained. I know that, in this House, upon an occasion immediately after that remarkable phrase had been uttered, I took the liberty—if it be one; I beg pardon—but I took the liberty of asking every one, who held a conspicuous position on the opposite benches, whether he adopted the phrase or not—I remember more especially the right hon. Baronet, the Member of Tamworth, on that occasion saying that he was not responsible for any language but his own. The right hon. Baronet was in the painful situation of being in close connexion and association with a man, in whose expressions he did not think it judicious to express his concurrence. I own myself to be astonished that when the word, the contumelious and exasperating word, aliens—(was it not contumelious, and is it to be borne?)—when I say that phrase, which has become fatally memorable, fell from the lips of the bold and aspiring man who gave it utterance, I own myself Sir to be astonished, that ARTHUR, Duke of WELLINGTON, did not start up and exclaim, ‘Hold, I have seen the aliens do their duty.’ The Duke of WELLINGTON, is not, I am inclined to believe, a man of an excitable temperament. His mind is of a cast too martial to be easily moved; but, notwithstanding his habitual inflexibility, I cannot help thinking that when he heard his Roman

Catholic countrymen (for we are his countrymen) designated by a phrase as offensive as the abundant vocabulary of his eloquent confederate could supply—I cannot help thinking that he ought to have recollected the many fields of fight in which we have been contributors to his renown. Yes, Sir—‘The battles, sieges, fortunes that he has passed,’ ought to have come back upon him. He ought to have remembered that, from the earliest achievement in which he displayed that military genius which has placed him foremost in the annals of modern warfare, down to that last and surpassing combat which has made his name imperishable, from Assaye to Waterloo, the Irish soldiers, with whom your armies are filled, were the inseparable auxiliaries to the glory with which his unparalleled successes have been crowned. Whose were the athletic arms that drove your bayonets, at Vimiera, through the phalanxes that never reeled in the shock of war before? What desperate valour climbed the steeps and filled the moats at Badajoz? Ah, all his victories should have rushed and crowded back upon his memory—Vimiera, Badajoz, Salamanca, Albueras, Toulouse, and last, and of all the greatest, ———. Tell me, for you were there (pointing to Sir HENRY HARDINGE)—(I appeal to the gallant soldier before me, from whose opinions I differ, but who bears, I know, a generous heart in an intrepid breast), Tell me, for you must needs remember—on that day when the destinies of mankind were trembling in the balance—while death fell in showers upon them, when the artillery of France, levelled with a precision of the most deadly science, played upon them—when her legions, incited by the voice, and inspired by the example of their mighty leader, rushed gain and again to the onset, tell me, if, for an instant, when to hesitate for an instant was to be lost, the ‘Aliens’ blanched? And when at length the moment for

the last and decisive movement had arrived, and the valour which had so long been wisely checked, was at last let loose; when, with words familiar, but immortal, the Great Captain exclaimed—'Up, Lads, and at them!'—tell me, if Catholic Ireland, with less heroic valour than the natives of this your own glorious isle, precipitated herself upon the foe? The blood of England, Scotland, and of Ireland, flowed in the same stream—on the same field, when the chill morning dawned, their dead lay cold and stark together—in the same deep pit their bodies were deposited—the green corn of spring is now breaking from their commingled dust—the dew falls from heaven upon their union in the grave; partakers in every peril, in the glory shall we not be permitted to participate; and shall we be told as a requital, that we are estranged from the noble country for whose salvation our life blood was poured out?"

Lord FRANCIS EGERTON'S motion was lost by a majority of EIGHTY. This division took place on the twenty-first of February, and on the tenth of April, the third reading was carried by a majority of FIFTY-FIVE. In the debate on the third reading, Mr. Sergeant WOLFE made a short, but in our opinion, one of the most telling speeches during the entire discussion. Notwithstanding the lisp which affected his utterance, WOLFE was an eloquent speaker. He was too a very accomplished scholar. He occasionally, before Emancipation, mixed in Catholic politics. He was not, however, very prominent in the agitation. He was one of those who profited by the exertions of others. He was lifted to the office of Chief Baron, as was O'LOUGHLIN to that of Master of the Rolls, on the shoulders of O'CONNELL. However, this speech, on the third reading, showed him deserving of the position. He took a new line of argument—one becoming a Catholic and one of the people. The tone of

it too, was one which every Catholic ought proudly hold. There should be no subserviency.

“I think it impossible,” he said, “for any man to take a review of this debate, both on the present and on former occasions, without being satisfied that the real, indeed the only, objection which is relied upon against extending to Ireland the municipal institutions which you have established in England and Scotland, is the fact that the majority of the people of Ireland are Roman Catholics. It is very true, Sir, that in the course of the debate, arguments have been urged which are independent of this fact, and apply equally to municipal institutions under all circumstances and at all times; but I am bold enough to say that these arguments would never have been ventured into the field, if they stood upon their single merits, and if it were not hoped that their infirmity would escape exposure, under cover of the vague and misty terrors which hon. members have endeavoured to excite through the medium of that fact. Who, for instance, in the absence of that fact, who would have ventured to propound that the municipal Corporations of Ireland would have no legitimate functions to perform?—as if it were possible that urban communities, having a population ranging from three thousand to three hundred thousand souls, could by possibility be found without local wants to supply or local interests to further. In the absence of this fact, no man whose moral sense was not utterly perverted, would have regarded it as consistent either with the principles of abstract justice, or express stipulations of the Union, and that, in England, you should place in the hands of the people the management of their own affairs, through the medium of Corporations, which pervaded the whole country, which opened at the door of every man, a field of honorable, if not exalted ambition—which gratified the national pride, called into

activity, and nourished the habits which are the result and the best security of freedom, and at the same time increased their power and influence over the public councils ; while, in Ireland, a part of the same empire, equal by nature and by contract, you should wrest from the people the management of the most home affairs, subject them to a central administration, which mortified their self-respect, which increased the power of the crown and not of the people, and as between them and the other portions of the empire, deprived them of their just share of influence in the state. In the absence of the fact I speak of, no man could have thought this just, and no man could have thought it safe ; no man who valued the Union at a pin's fee, and who saw that the two countries are connected together, not by physical ties—for the sea rolls between them—but by common interests and social affinities alone, could have the hardihood to suggest a distinction which leads so fearfully to separation ! It is the fact of the people of Ireland being Roman Catholics, which emboldened hon. members to advance these things ; without that fact, they would not have an inch to stand upon. It is the hinge of all their arguments ? Now, how does that fact touch the question of Corporations ? Natural connexion between them there is none ; it is not pretended that there is anything incongruous between the Catholic religion and municipal institutions ; it is not pretended that a Roman Catholic may not make as worthy a Mayor or as goodly an Alderman as a Protestant. The fact, Sir, bears upon the question thus, and only thus ; it is said that these institutions carry power with them to the people ; that the majority of the people of Ireland being Catholic, this power will fall for the greater part into their hands ; and, lastly, that they will exercise this power so as to

increase the dangers of the church. Now, I will deal fairly with this argument. I admit those institutions do impart power to the people. I admit that they do make the public more puissant in public affairs; I admit that they quicken public opinion, render it more authentic, more self-derived, more pure; and that they give it force both by adding to its worth, and by supplying it with a constitutional organ for its expression. I further admit that the Roman Catholics of Ireland, being the majority of that people, will acquire in Ireland the greater part of this new power. I will even admit, for the purposes of this debate, that it will be divided between them and the Protestants of Ireland, in the ratio in which they constitute the population. The fact however is, that the distribution will be not in the single ratio of their numbers, but in a ratio compounded of that ratio, and the ratio in which the property and intellect of the country are divided. But I admit the fact of an increase of power to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. Is it not manifest, however, that the same circumstances which carry increased power to the people of that country, have already augmented the power of the people—the Protestant people, of England and Scotland, and is it not clear that the result must be the maintenance of the general balance of power in the different portions of the empire, if Corporations were withheld from all? But I waive this argument in this debate. I will admit the fact; not only of a positive increase of power in the Catholics of Ireland, but of a relative increase. But here my admission stops; I deny that this increase will increase the dangers of the Church. I deny that any increase of power, which grows out of equal and fair dealing, can increase those dangers. I assert, on the contrary, that to withhold this power, on account of the Church, will more increase those dangers. I affirm, that to make the sup-

posed good or safety of the Church the cause of the pretence of establishing a distinction which affronts the public sentiment, will aggravate all the feelings which constitute the only danger to the Church. Wherein, I ask, do the dangers to the Church consist? They consist in the feelings which are incident to the anomalous position in which you insist upon maintaining her. I object not now to the position in which you think fit to maintain the Church Establishment of Ireland; but surely, the difficulties and dangers that are attached by the very ordonnances of nature to that position, are sufficient to exhaust the cares and anxieties of her friends, without loading her with the odium of being the cause of national disparagement. Has the Church of Ireland not enough of difficulties to struggle with as it is? She is the richest Church, in the poorest country, with the smallest congregation, in reference to the population, in the world. Perhaps it will be said that the circumstances of Ireland and the state of parties made concession inevitable in 1829; but are not all the circumstances of the country now similar to the circumstances of 1829? If there be a difference, does it not consist, exclusively, in your greater inability to withhold now than then? Is Ireland not as profoundly moved upon this subject, as she was on the question of emancipation in 1829? But there was an Association in 1829, which neither statute nor common law could put down, and which it was necessary to put down by emancipation. What! is there no Association;—and where is the statute on the principle of common law that can reach it any more than the Association of 1829? But the state of parties in this house made it necessary to concede in 1829. Sir, the state of parties in this house now, is stronger for concession than the state of parties in 1829; the majorities in favor of it have been greater

and more continuous. Is the public opinion of England less pronounced upon it now than at that epoch? But the House of Lords is now against concession! To be sure it is, and so it was in 1829, but yielded in 1829, and so it will in due season on this question; the only point of difference is in the circumstances of the two periods—that, in 1829, no Ministry could be formed upon the principle of resisting concession—it remains to be tried if such an Administration can be formed now. I venture to predict that it cannot—I venture to say that the differences upon the subject, among Hon. Members on the other side, would soon render this an open question, if they ventured to take power without adjusting it; and the best step to complete the parallel in the history of the two measures will be, that Hon. Members will themselves propose the measure they now resist.”

The Bill was brought up to the House of Lords on the thirteenth of April, and as a matter of course, read a first time. On the fifth of May, when Lord MELBOURNE moved that the House do go into Committee, the Duke of WELINGTON proposed that the Committee be adjourned to the ninth of June, in order that the Tithe and Church Bills, and the Poor Law measure, be brought up from the Lower House, before the Municipal Bill was considered. On the ninth of June, the proposition for going into Committee was further postponed, on the motion of Lord LYNDEHURST, to the third of July—because the Irish Church Bill had not yet reached their Lordships.

In the mean time, on the twentieth of June, WILLIAM THE FOURTH died, and his death of course brought matters to a stand still. The Municipal Bill—the Church Bill, and the Poor Law Bill were withdrawn.

It is not necessary to make any reference to the Church Bill, as it was withdrawn before it went through Committee. We shall find it re-introduced, and carried in 1838—

It will then be more opportune to discuss its provisions. But though the Irish Poor Law was also deferred, we may enter into its consideration now, as it was, in its main features, the same as the measure which was subsequently introduced, and is now law.

As we have already said, the Irish people and the Clergy differed with Mr. O'CONNELL on the subject of Poor Laws. They were almost to a man in favour of the introduction of some system that would compel the owners of the soil to relieve the destitution that existed. Dr. MURRAY published this year a letter, stating that the entire body of the Hierarchy were, *una voce*, in favour of Poor Laws. O'CONNELL was opposed to them—Firstly—on the principle that no person has a right to be supported by the industry of another—Secondly—Because Poor Rates tend to lessen the capital of the Country, and to lower wages—Thirdly—Because, in Ireland, Poor Rates must be confiscation, or they would be of no use.

“ I have,” he said, in the debate on the second reading of the Bill—“ I have certainly a strong impression that a poor law has never done any good to any country where it has been adopted. I make that avowal frankly. I do not hesitate to declare, then, that my own individual opinion is not favourable to a poor law ; but least of all, is it favorable to such a law as this which you propose to give to Ireland. I would only implore you, before the step is decisively taken, to have it fully, maturely, and deliberately considered in all its bearings—to give nothing to the unholy cry of those who hold themselves out as the especial patrons and friends of the poor, because they are favourable to these laws. I entreat you to yield to no clamour of that kind, but fully and maturely to consider the bill in every stage. Then, be the result what it may, I shall feel that I have done my duty. I have not (I own it) moral courage enough to oppose a poor law altogether. I yield

to the necessity of doing something ; but I am not deceitful enough to prophesy that you will reap any lasting or solid advantage from the introduction of Poor Laws into Ireland."

On the general principle of Poor Laws, we have already so fully expressed our opinion, that it is unnecessary now to enlarge on that branch of the question. But we fully agree with Mr. O'CONNELL, that where there were, as reported by the Commissioners of Poor Inquiry, TWO MILLIONS THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND persons in a state of destitution, for several weeks in each year, the Workhouse system; which provides for but eighty thousand paupers; is not an adequate or a just measure of Relief. It visits enormous taxation on the Rate-payers without corresponding advantage to the poor. In that respect there is now an important change—for the infirm, the disabled, &c., must be supported either at their own houses, or in the Workhouses—and, in case of famine, the able-bodied can be set to work, and supported in return. This is an important alteration ; and undoubtedly, if the rates were more equitably distributed, the system is now likely to be beneficial to the Poor. What should we have done these last two years without some poor law, however inadequate it was. Nor can we contemplate any change in the political or social condition of the country, that would render a legal provision for the destitute unnecessary. On the details of this measure we may hereafter enlarge.

The position of the contest between both parties, made it necessary for Mr. O'CONNELL to keep up, in full vigour, the agitation which was now existing in Ireland. He went over there during the Easter recess, and attended several meetings of the National Association. When the Duke of WELLINGTON'S amendment to adjourn the proposition for going into committee until the month of

June, was carried, Lord JOHN RUSSELL made the following declaration in the House of Commons:—

“At present, I feel after the vote of the other night, which cannot be interpreted in a way which will lead us to any thing conclusive as to the course of proceeding of the other House, that it is essential at the present moment that all in the majority of the House of Commons should remain firmly united together on the present occasion—and I think I may say that if the supporters of the present Administration continue their present confidence in it, that, with such support, and with such a majority, THE MINISTRY WILL NOT DESERT THEM.”

This was an invitation to the country to sustain the government, and accordingly, we find meetings held for the purpose of declaring confidence in the Whig ministers. In Dublin, at the Coburg Gardens, there was one on an extraordinary scale, and most important, too, by reason of the influence of the persons who took part in its proceedings.

Thus was the position of affairs, when WILLIAM died. His malady, with which he was some time affected, was water on the chest. The King was an honest, well-disposed Sovereign—but somewhat crotchety, and influenced by those about him. At the beginning of his reign, he was very popular, and the people loved to call him “the Sailor King,” and “WILLIAM, the Reformer.” But after his unaccountable dismissal of the MELBOURNE Government, consequent upon the death of Lord SPENCER, he lost a good deal of his well-earned popularity. He had, it is well known, a great antipathy to O'CONNELL, and during the discussions respecting his getting office, he was said to have resisted any suggestion of the kind. His death left the Throne in the possession of our present gracious Sovereign. Never did Monarch take pos-

session of her inheritance amidst greater joy and enthusiasm than greeted VICTORIA—particularly in Ireland. She was our “bright star of hope.” We expected much from her. But independently of such feeling, her youth—her sex—the recollection of the Orange attempt to cheat her of her inheritance—all made the Irish nation right loyally attached to her, and her advent to the Throne was hailed with enthusiasm and delight.

The manner in which she is said to have read her declaration to the Privy Council, on her accession, though she was then barely eighteen, impressed the public mind with the conviction that her intellect and mental cultivation were both of a high order of excellence. “There is much,” as Sir ROBERT PEEL said, in speaking of the occasion, “there is much that art cannot imitate nor lessons teach,” and which shows the possession of great natural endowments. These VICTORIA displayed in a most extraordinary manner on the morning she became Queen, and in presence of the assembled magnates of the land. Yet at such moment, violence of Party was directed against her and her excellent mother. The abuse, on the very day King WILLIAM died, of the *Times*, was the most scandalous ever written. It dared not have been uttered against humbler persons. The exalted station of the parties protected the paper from what was so justly merited—exemplary chastisement. VICTORIA, it was supposed, was educated in those political principles to which her father, the Duke of KENT, was attached. The Duchess of KENT entertained similar opinions, and some of her most intimate friends and advisers were of the liberal party. Lord DUBHAM was one of them. The Conservatives were naturally fearful that all hope of Court favor was taken from them, and nothing could equal their disloyal annoyance—and speaking of the

Duchess of KENT was the ostensible object of the attack. The *Times* proclaimed that the British nation "would not suffer under irresponsible, selfish, backstairs tyranny—especially in intriguing, sordid, female foreign tyranny."

In proportion as the Orange faction exhibited such hostility, the "Queen's Friends" were trebly active in her support. O'CONNELL was amongst the foremost of them. He addressed a Letter to the National Association calling on them to organise a Society to be called the "Queen's Friends." As a General Election was at hand, he himself proceeded to Dublin and commenced an active agitation. He had Meetings of the General Committee of the Trades' Union and of the General Association alternately, and at each of them his speeches were buoyant and spirit-stirring. He certainly had at the time great hopes for Ireland. An extract from his speech to the Trades' Political Union, will illustrate this remark. This Meeting had reference to the Dublin Election. Mr. O'CONNELL was a candidate for the Representation of Dublin and Kilkenny. He was received with the utmost demonstrations of affection and respect. When the shouts of applause had subsided, he said—

"Now, that is very odd. I am now only thirty-seven years struggling for my country, I have grown old in her employment, and I am amply rewarded when I look at your cheerful and kind countenances. It does me good to look into your faces. I began my career in the service of my country, by opposing that measure so fraught with evil consequences for Ireland—the legislative union, and I have long struggled for its repeal. Do you know that I am a repealer still? I think that I have yet left enough of life either to render it unnecessary or to carry it. I have now avowed before you that I am in the pro-

gress of a great experiment for Ireland. The struggle in my earlier years was one of doubt and difficulty. I was opposed by many; I was taunted and despised by numbers, I was betrayed by some, and scarcely supported by any. Yet the struggle was not an unhappy one; for the humming of human happiness sounded ever softly and sweetly in my ears, and if I be now alone, I am but the more able to devote all my energies to the one object. (Here the learned gentleman became so affected that he could scarcely speak.) Yes, the whole and sole object of my life is to serve my country—to see this beautiful land rescued from the misery which God meant to prevent, but which wicked man has inflicted upon her. There is not spread beneath the bright rays of the glorious sun a land so beautiful as ours. There is no land so lovely, no land so fertile—no land so productive of the richest fruits of the earth. Her harvests are most abundant, and she produces everything that can delight the eye and gratify the taste. Yet there is no country on the face of the globe so stricken down as she is—no country whose sons are more oppressed—no country where misery so prevails—disease stalks in gaunt forms every where around our isle. The blessings that Almighty God has heaped on her, have been blighted in their effects by the curses of man. Instead of being as the beautiful garden that nature made her, our land is like a wide churchyard, all filled with the corpses of her sons. Would you think me honest, if I did not contend against the causes of such a scene? Would you think me in the smallest degree worthy of your confidence, if I did not endeavour to effect a change in so unnatural a scene—to render her an oasis—a bright green spot even in all the rest of a desert world? For, oh! our beautiful island could be made a paradise upon earth, if

evil-minded men would but do her justice. What is the first thing necessary to effect this change? Good Government. What reduced her to her miserable condition? Bad Government. What were the principles of this bad Government? Division among ourselves—making religion a passport to power, and a cause of dissension among men—profaning her sacred name, and making men hate men for her sake—hating and murdering one another in the name of God, of peace, and charity. These were the principles on which our Government was carried on. Only last week, the mother sent forth her three gay and gallant children to amuse themselves by the bonfire lighted in commemoration of the day. They were guiltless of any crime—they committed no offence. And did they ever come back to her? Did the affectionate mother of her boys ever again hear the loved sound of their youthful voices? No; for the fell Orangeman prowled in the dark, and the deed of blood was done. The guiltless, harmless children were sent to their loving mother cold and lifeless. Our duty here is a difficult one. We come for a double purpose. We are working out the grand experiment, whether we can obtain justice from the British Parliament, or whether we will find it necessary to call for a Parliament of our own. You authorised me before, when I last addressed you in assembled thousands, as I do now, to make this experiment. I told you I was going over to the British Parliament, to try if we could obtain such justice as would render it unnecessary for us to call for a repeal of the Union; you then promised that you would entirely abandon the project of Repeal, if it were rendered unnecessary by English justice. And you will now renew your promise (Cries of "yes, yes, we do"). I proclaim again from this spot that the agitation of Repeal will be effectually and for

ever put down, if Ireland obtain those measures which she would expect from a parliament of her own, and which would put her on a footing of equality with other nations. Now, we have the fairest possible opportunity of performing our experiment. The prejudices that formerly prevailed against Ireland, and all things Irish, are no longer about the throne. George the Third was—a mistaken man. George the Fourth had a bad taste in wives. William the Fourth, our lamented Sovereign, meant well towards us; but I must say, that when I heard him speaking in support of the coercion bill, there was a cordiality in his voice that I have never had an opportunity of observing in any of his speeches in favour of any good measure. The young Queen has the best possible inclination towards this country—she was educated under the eyes of a most affectionate mother, and with the greatest care—and never yet did an illustrious lady conduct herself with so much discretion, so much delicacy and absence of party feeling, as that excellent mother has done. The daughter, young and lovely, with all her mother's amiable qualities, knowing nothing but what is virtuous—with such a lady on the throne, the people of this country are led to hope that their country will yet be

‘ Great, glorious and free,

First flower of the earth, and first gem of the sea.’

“ If ever there was a time for working the experiment of seeking for justice, this is it. We have the ministry with us.—Hurrah, then, for the ministry. We have got Lord MULGRAVE with us, and have the QUEEN with us. The Orangemen used to boast of their loyalty. They used to call us disaffected, and rebels. In their teeth, the vagabonds, I fling the term disaffected and rebels. Who are the rebels, now, I would ask? If it were convenient

to poison the Queen, she would get her gruel before to-morrow morning. Yes, the disaffected vagabonds.—Hurrah then for the loyal Irish.—We are now working out an experiment; the news which I receive from all parts of the country, is of the most cheering description; the people are perceiving that their party feuds were only calculated to benefit the enemies of their country, and they are giving up their fighting. The more reasonable and just Protestants are joining the side of justice, but the blockheads of Orangemen seem to forget that the Queen may live long. She is young, and will, I hope, outlive the best of them. Did you hear what WELLINGTON said in parliament the other day, when he found that the Queen had retained the Liberal administration, and was surrounded by ladies of the most unquestionable honour, but of Whig connexions; when he saw the true commanding officer, though in petticoats, he said there should be an end to corporate monopoly; the valiant Duke wheeled to the right about face, and declared that the Corporations must positively be reformed next session. This is a fact that any corporator knows just as well as we do. They are quite aware that they are fighting for a dead horse, and much good may the carrion do them. So you perceive that they are dead beaten. They will, to be sure, be vapouring till the election commences; but then there will as much be a man found to come forward as there is one at present under my hat. Did you ever hear of the three points with a pin? They are worn out since the last election, and they want to have them renewed; but where is the money? They got plenty of money from the Carlton Club last election, to put me out of Parliament, and they succeeded in depriving me of a seat for two days and part of an evening. They spent £40,000 then; but I would be glad to know where such a sum would come from again. HAMILTON is too know-

ing to spend his money on such a speculation—as for ugly WEST, he will get in on no terms. I said at the General Association the other day, that it would be a shame for Dublin to send such an ugly fellow to Parliament, since we have got a Queen—don't you think it would? What an opinion she would have of the men of Dublin, if they had not a handsomer representative than Sow-WEST. He may say that I am growing old, and that I have the ugliness of age; but he cannot deny that I am a merry old fellow at all events. I will walk, run, wrestle, or throw the stone with WEST yet, with all the difference of our ages.”

This extract contains in a brief space, a fair specimen of the pathos, the sarcasm, and the humour which he, with such happy effect, always mingled in his popular addresses. But to appreciate them fully, they should have been heard. The next generation will not be able to estimate O'CONNELL'S oratory at its full value. Beside what remained of the speeches of BURKE, GRATAN, SHERIDAN, ERSKINE, PITT, FOX, COMMING, BROUGHAM, and SHEIL, they will not stand comparison as pieces of composition. But for effect on the hearers, none of the efforts of these great men were superior to his. His ease of manner and delivery—his fine person—his musical voice—his playful laugh—his humour—his perfect knowledge of human nature, made him unrivalled as a popular speaker.

In discussing his powers as an advocate, an able writer in the *Law Magazine*, thus speaks of his forensic eloquence, sustaining our remarks in every respect.

“ It is impossible to conceive a more powerful advocate than Mr. O'CONNELL was, before a Judge and Jury. They who have heard him in Parliament only, can form no notion of the man, such as he was, whilst wielding men's minds in his natural sphere of action. Impassioned

and vigorous as BROUGHAM, discreet, argumentative, and zealous for his client, and forgetful of himself, as LYNDHURST, he had a playfulness of humour, a readiness of wit to affix an irresistibly ludicrous epithet, or apply some story fraught with ridicule, in an appalling degree, where he pleased—a power, moreover, of the deepest pathos, to which the former two were strangers. No man that ever spoke, did probably possess the power of moving the feelings and passions of a Jury in the same degree as Mr. O'CONNELL. It was not with him, as it was with CURRAN, when touching words were delivered in a shrill cracked voice, without due pause or emphasis, or variety of intonation. The deep melody of O'CONNELL'S voice added force and dignity to what he uttered. The minor tones struck upon the heart with the solemn music of a distant bell at nightfall. To borrow the language of his country's bard,

' He ruled like a wizard the world of the heart,
And could call up its sunshine or draw down its showers.'

The following, too, if it had not been written by LIVY of CATO the Censor, one would have thought was composed by some modern linguist, to describe in classical talents, O'CONNELL'S powers. “ Si jus consuleres, peritissimus; si causa oranda esset, eloquentissimus—Orationes et pro se multæ, et pro aliis, et in alios; nam non solum accusando sed etiam causam dicendo fatigavit inimicos. Simultates nimis plures et exercuerunt eum, et ipse exercevit eas; nec facile dixeris utrum magis presserit eum nobilitas, an ille agitaverit nobilitatem. Linguae proculdubio acerbæ et immodice liberæ fuit—&c.”

The above suggests to us to give an extract from a letter written about this period to a foreigner, by an old friend of O'CONNELL'S, and a profound judge on every subject connected with intellectual acquirement—the letter was by the well known and highly respected Irishman, Mr.

JAMES ROCHE of Cork—he says “Lorsque l’emancipation des Catholiques permit enfin au Grand Agitateur de s’asseoir à la Chambre des Communes, lon ne prenait pas garde à lui. Vint ensuite le bill de Reforme, et alors on commença à preter l’oreille aux discours de l’orateur. On trouva sa voix tantot douce, tantot tonnante, sa parole abondante comme un fleuve, ses formes hardies et nouvelles, et je ne sais quel charme inconnu dans cette-eloquence, ou les elans de la passion se trouvaient temperes par une sensibilite expansive, et les morsures de la colere adoucies par une ironie tellement fine, qu’on dirait une legere dorure sur du fer, ou des files de soie sur du cable. **M. O’CONNELL**, en un mot, a toujours une originalite qui charme, et une puissance qui subjugue,&c.”

O’CONNELL was not, during the year 1837, so much a theme of calumny and abuse as he was in the years 1835—36.—His enemies, and the factious opponents of the ministers, got for a time tired of it. They saw that his reputation was unassailable. At the great meeting of the General Association, immediately after his arrival in Ireland, he thus speaks on this subject, and then launches into the great theme which occupied his mind, the sustentation of the Queen and her minister. “I have often said,” he exclaimed, “that there never was a man so well calumniated as I am and have been. I am the best abused man in the world. Even Napoleon, in the palmy days of his greatest glory, was not so well abused as the humble individual who now stands before you. It is a great thing to be compared to Napoleon in anything, and in this point of comparison I am far above him. Yes, I do stand before you by far the best abused, calumniated of men.—I began my career, and at once the Tory press assailed me. Some of them abused me once a week, because they were published but once a week. Others abused me three days in the week, and not oftener, because their publica-

tion was not more frequent ; and others abused me six days in the week, leaving me on Sunday, alone, free from their vituperation. In the commencement of my career I felt this not very pleasant ; but after some time I became accustomed to it, and whenever the abuse slackened, I always concluded that I had failed in some part of my public duty. Since I went into parliament, I have run the gauntlet through every species of abuse and vituperation. The newspapers have been most constant in their attacks. The Tories cannot sit down to a public dinner without making me the theme of their abusive calumny ; they could not digest their food without seasoning it with speaking ill of me. They cannot hold a meeting for any purpose without introducing the same perpetual everlasting subject. Some time since, their invective became more scarce, and I grew displeased at the lessening of their abuse, for I felt it as a silent censure upon myself : but now it is as great as ever. It has been renewed with increased virulence, and I trust that by my exertions at next election, I may be deemed worthy of three times the abuse that I have ever received. What crime draws all this down upon my head ? Nothing, but my firm determination not to suffer my country to remain in her disgraceful state of provincial degradation. Nothing but my firm determination, so often expressed, that the system of misgovernment which reduced my native land to such a condition, and her sons to sufferings unheard of, miseries unparalleled, should cease—that it should cease by the benign operation of a domestic legislature—that it should cease under the fostering and protecting care of a native parliament ; for that was my first and my great object—the hope of accomplishing this led me along—this was the great point that attracted me—this was the leading star of my political life, which shed over it a brightness that compensated me for its troubles. If I now seem to be

pursuing a different course, it is but one of experiment and trial. I am pursuing my present course, to ascertain whether Ireland is to become an integral portion of the empire, equal in rights and privileges to the other portion of it, without the Repeal; or whether she is to rise like a day-star in the brightness of its glory, to shed a ray of hope over the rest of the world by obtaining the Repeal. I have now laid before you the entire front and bearing of the causes which have drawn down such hatred—such virulent abuse. I myself have never spared the lash where it has been deserved. I have always boldly and freely spoken out my mind. I have described, in language suitable to them both, the monstrosity of an abuse, and the villainy of the men that perpetuated it: and I have never relaxed in my efforts, 'till the one was abolished, and the others were converted or rendered powerless. So will I act till all abuses are gone. In my struggle for my country, I long wished ardently to have the Government at my side. During that long struggle they were, however, prejudiced, virulent, oppressive, captious, and tricky. It is true, that some transitory moments of something like sunshine may have partially dispelled the darkness of our political horizon; but these moments were few. When Anglesey, upon his first coming, gave us as his advice, those memorable words—"Agitate, agitate, agitate," his advice was good; but upon his second arrival amongst us, it would seem that his spirit had undergone a change, for he strenuously endeavoured to crush that agitation which he had counselled us to begin. The Government was always hostile to us. At the Court of the Sovereign, we had no friend to plead our cause. So great was the gloom that darkened over us, that all the light of liberty seemed for ever fled. The gloom that always lessened, and finally totally extinguish-

ed the light of reason in the mind of George III., rendered him much more fitted to receive and retain those prejudices which it was the business of those about him to instil. George IV. was not one who liked liberty, either in public or private, and therefore not one likely to befriend us. He was not one who would even try to cast off those prejudices which obscured his mental vision. This was not our fault. For when he deigned to come among us, we received him with all the enthusiastic loyalty so characteristic of the Irish. We cheered him from the commencement of the day till night came on—and we would have carried it even into the night, but that with the affectionate consideration which no nation possesses in so high a degree, we wished to let our Monarch repose. And what was the return for our loyalty? He treated us during his whole reign as his bitterest enemies; and the only relaxation of oppression and hostility during its course, was when that measure was passed, which was extorted from him by the united voice of the Irish people demanding it from this room, and which was granted merely because it could not be withheld. Wm. IV. gave us something better, he gave us the Reform Bill. Up to the present time, then, we had no friend, and many enemies at Court, and the Ministry was always hostile to us. Often have I sighed for the reign of a Monarch who would give us equal and impartial justice; and have feared that I would never see the day when such happiness would be our lot—blessed be God, that day has come. We have lived to see it; we have lived to see upon the Throne, a Monarch who will do us justice; who has been educated, without prejudice, in strict privacy, under the eye of an excellent and affectionate mother. We are governed by a Monarch who will extend her fostering and maternal care alike over all classes of her subjects. We have an excellent Ministry who will do

justice to this unfortunate country as far as they can. We have a Ministry who, for our sake, are fighting against a numerous and bigotted party, both in this kingdom and in England. Scotland is much with us, and the mighty spirit of Reform in England is on our side. With all this help, should we not work for ourselves? Are we to be idle while others are labouring on our account? The question I now ask you is, whether you will act for yourselves or no? From this spot upon which I stand, I call upon you to arouse yourselves and be active. I call upon you to rally round the standard of liberty; I call upon you to rally round the Ministry; I call upon you to rally for Ireland; and, loudest, I call upon you to rally round your Queen."

He then goes into a review of the state of the Irish Representation, and the prospects which, by proper exertions, the coming election afforded of improving it. As the eye runs over the columns of the Journals that contain this remarkable speech, one cannot fail to be struck with the indications of the feeling of the meeting, as conveyed by the Reporters to the reader, by such expressions as are here written in brackets—*shouts of applause—loud laughter—great cheering—continued laughter*. Thus alternating every ten lines, and showing the succession of effects which his varied powers produced on the meeting. His complete mastery over the feelings of his countrymen, at a public meeting, will in after times be incredible, as it was unprecedented, and will probably be for ever unequalled. About the same time that O'CONNELL was delivering this great oration on behalf of good government, the Marquess of WESTMEATH attacked him in Parliament, through Lord MULGRAVE, who was then attending his Parliamentary duties. He charged the Lord Lieutenant with entertaining at the Castle, a man convicted of sedition, and a traitor to

boot. O'CONNELL was not a man to allow such a charge to pass unnoticed, and as a specimen of his scolding "rough-work" talents, we give the reply he made at the General Association to the Marquess's attack. "I will now" he said, "if the Association permits me, refer to a matter personal to myself. I read in the newspapers that came here this morning, a publication called a debate. It would purport to be something said in the House of Lords. At the head of the newspaper column containing this debate, stands the Marquess of WESTMEATH, and it is my duty to take notice of the matter. The publication says that the Marquess of WESTMEATH stated that Lord MULGRAVE had entertained at the Castle of Dublin, a man convicted of a serious offence against the law, although never punished. I must say that is a gross falsehood as regards me—indeed, the only way of describing those things is by calling them by their own names—it is a complicated lie. Why, I dined at the Castle, if such be an honour, at the time that Lord WELLESLEY first represented the Tories in Ireland—when he was the Lord Lieutenant of the Tories; and as to the invitation to dinner, I will stand the test with the Marquess of WESTMEATH; for I believe I gave as many dinners in one year as he has given during the entire of his life. I do not consider it any great honor either to dine inside or outside the castle, but the real fact, I think, might have been stated. But the point for which I call it a complicated lie is that of "my being convicted of a serious offence." I never was convicted of any offence; and if the Marquess of WESTMEATH is able to read, which I doubt considerably, he must have read the papers, returned to the House of Lords with respect to the proceedings carried on against me by Mr. BLACKBURN, the then Attorney-General, and from which he has seen, or may see, that his statement is false.

I refused to plead to an indictment, because I had undertaken to carry that indictment, before judgment, to the House of Lords, and that was only an indictment for disobeying a proclamation. I have all my life disobeyed, and always will disobey, any illegal proclamation. I would not think it necessary to notice the paltry calumny, but that the speech includes a charge of high treason against me, and states that I was equal to the traitors of 1798. I am bound to say that whoever made use of those expressions, he is a liar, and he knows he is a liar—I feel it my duty to state, that I am a more loyal man than the person who made such an assertion; and the truth of that accusation against me may be judged of from this, that the Lord Lieutenant told the person that he would not give the least credit to his assertion, and yet that man is continued a Lord Lieutenant of a county in Ireland. I hope the government will be strong enough not to have any man in such a situation whose word cannot be believed. The Lord Lieutenant was reported to say, distinctly, that he did not deserve credit for the observations he made, because he made a statement previously against the gaoler of Mullingar, every word of which was false, according to the report. Surely, the Government will not leave the Marquess of WESTMEATH any longer as Lord Lieutenant of the county. They can easily get a more proper person. If I were produced as a witness, and would speak of him precisely as he deserves, taking care, however, to come at the “wind’s side” of him, for he is rather unsavoury, in breath. I remember knowing, in early life, a Counsellor KELLER, who was remarkable for his good humour and his partiality to crack his joke. His real name was KALAHER. He was engaged at the election in Cork, and at that time every voter

was examined and cross-examined like a witness at a Nisi Prius trial. KELLER was bearing very hard against a voter who intended voting out of the estate of Colonel ——, who, as it happened, was the son of a married man, who, however, was married to another person not the mother of the colonel. The colonel's mother was a married lady, but she happened not to be married to the colonel's father. Notwithstanding that, he was as audacious as the newspapers make the Marquess of WESTMEATH. He assailed KELLER, and in an offensive tone of voice, exclaimed, "You, Mr. KELLER, or KALAHER, or what the deuce is your name?" "Colonel," replied KELLER, "you may call me any name you like, so long as you don't call me the son of a bad woman! So I say to Lord WESTMEATH, "you may call me any name you please, so you don't call me the son of a bad woman." It is really deplorable such men should consider themselves licensed to assail those who are struggling for their country."

Another specimen of his humour, sarcasm, and "rough work," exists in his speech, two days after this, at the National Trades' Political Union—"I have good news "for you," he said, addressing the trades:—

"As soon as we beat the Tories, the Queen will come to Ireland.—Oh, the Tories know right well that her breast is with old Ireland—instead of being surrounded by the *elite* of faction, as the last King's brother was—and, I will add, the last King too; by-the-bye, talking of the late King's brother, he came over here—he was exceedingly good natured. Our present Queen will, however, be really so; and oh! when she went to dissolve parliament the other day, she was cheered enthusiastically by the English, and I thank them for it. Now, I have heard the English cheer repeatedly, and I must say they have not the muscle which the Irish possess. One cheer

from Paddy, is worth the squeeling of the English for years. And it is you who will delight the Queen when she comes amongst us. That will be good work for us, but an evil omen for the Tories. They have had their share of the plunder wrung from the people's pockets—and now, as it occurs to me, you will give me leave to ask you, did you ever hear of Alderman SMYTH? He was not a scoundrel for nothing. There is not an Orange dog amongst them who would act the patriot for nothing.—Oh, no—they will not be rascals without getting something for it. There is no price for rascality—no reward for scoundrels—and these fellows, you may depend upon it, will act accordingly, and become industrious—I will not call it honest industry. Did you hear the account of the Duke of CUMBERLAND? He was, you know, the great leader, the grand master of the Orangemen. For shame—don't groan the *excellent* Duke of Cumberland. If I had hired a fellow to do exactly the act of despotism which this Duke of CUMBERLAND has done, he would not have acted half so well. If I had employed him to put down the party over which he was the head, it would not have been half so ably done. But I was going to tell you the fact as it appeared publicly. The moment this Duke was made King, he was the grand master of the Orangemen, and who used to drink the glorious memory of King WILLIAM THE THIRD, who put down popery and slavery, and established liberty, what did he do when he got to Hanover? He put down the constitution—dissolved the parliament, saying he would reign absolutely, without law or constitution. If we had the misfortune of having that man as our king—if he were to reign over Ireland and England—

A voice in the crowd—"God forbid."

MR. O'CONNELL.—Blessed be his holy name, he has done so. But if, unfortunately, he had succeeded to the

throne, his first act would be to proclaim the reform bill as a dead letter—to repeal the emancipation act. “Ah! na boecklis.” He would declare the people of England should reign just as he pleased—according to his good will and pleasure. He has done what I have stated, although he was the head of the Orangemen. He has extinguished the very name of a constitution in Hanover, and placed in abeyance every form of law and jurisprudence. Did I not tell you he was a tyrant, and that his followers would be so if they dared? Why, the voice of every good and virtuous man in Europe is raised in condemnation of this arbitrary and oppressive act. Do you know, I want to tell you a thing which I am sure will be very amusing to you? Who do you think is his secretary? Honest RANDY PLUNKETT. He is gone over to Hanover, to act as such, and his name actually appears at the foot of the proclamation. It is signed “*Schell*,” which in German means RANDY PLUNKETT. A friend of mine was once asked, (having determined to go to Germany,) did he speak German—O, no, said he, I do not; but my brother plays the German flute, and that will do as well. The secretary of the King of Hanover, though a German, is no other than RANDY PLUNKETT, of the county Meath. It is delightful to think, that this exhibition made by the grand master of the Orangemen, describes in its true colours, what would be the conduct of those miscreants over whom he was placed as the acknowledged head; had they been enabled to assume the reins of power in this country. I am glad that I, for one, was an humble instrument in prostrating their traitorous designs, in changing the succession to the throne, and giving the crown to a monster who would attempt to trample on the liberties of the German people; and would do so here, if we were not too strong for him.” To un-

derstand the full force of the last portion of this sarcastic effusion, it should be known that Baron SCHELL was the King of Hanover's Minister, who counter-signed his Majesty's gracious declaration, on ascending the throne, that he would not permit them to retain the constitution granted them by the late King. The Hon. RANDAL PLUNKETT, son of Lord DUNSANY, was a bitter enemy of O'CONNELL's, and though, of a Catholic family, was a fierce ally of the Orangemen—and O'CONNELL could not let pass the opportunity of hitting him, by taking advantage of the word *schell*—the way the Jews pronounce "sell"—to insinuate the motives for that gentleman's political actions. It was bitterly severe—too much so. It arose to his mind at the moment, and the hit was too good to let pass,

We scarcely think political warfare justifies this—more particularly, when we recollect the importance attached to every syllable uttered by O'CONNELL—how and where it circulated, and how it is perpetuated. Let us, however, hear how a writer of considerable talent justifies the use of this language—

"O'CONNELL is," says the writer, in a publication remarkable for its point and wit—"O'CONNELL is a man of the days of antiquity; thrown, by the chance of his birth, upon a state of society marked by egotism and cowardice. He is an ardent Tribune—impetuous, impassioned, because he is convinced—convinced, because his pleadings are not for personal interests, but in the cause of an oppressed nation—of a country which is his own, and which is in extreme suffering. O'CONNELL has, at one and the same time, something of the historical personage and of the hero of romance about him—something of those heroes, imaged forth by SHAKESPEARE, in his vast proportions. The majestic outlines of this statue of antiquity, came out in bold relief against the pale and cha-

acterless background of this epoch. I have never seen O'CONNELL; but at the mention of his name, my thoughts revert back to those proud-crested and faithful knights, whom the sculptors of former times represented upon the monuments, armed as for war, but with their hands joined as in prayer; an unsullied falchion by their side, and a marble greyhound reposing at their feet.

“England rails at him as an agitator—she assails with insults, a courage that she has failed to subdue by the influence of fear. And let the world remark that she has never essayed to corrupt him, although the infamy of corruption be better known in London than anywhere in the rest of the world. There are natures of such a stamp, that the idea of corrupting them cannot even be conceived. This tacit homage to O'CONNELL from his enemies, renders him invulnerable to calumny.

“In the public addresses of “the great Agitator” of Ireland, he goes straight to the mark, scorning all circuitous approaches, and disregarding parliamentary forms and etiquette. He calls things by their right names, writes his terrible demands as with the point of a sword, and nails on a name and description upon every mask.

“Perhaps in times of other complexion, he would have used weapons of more courtesy; but, in times like the present, he knows better than any one else the fitting weapons. The fiery O'CONNELL has studied his countrymen; he sees that it is not with minced phrases and clipped words—with pointed madrigals—with buttoned foils—that a people are to be roused, whom a long and cruel tyranny has crushed down, and plunged in the torpor of hopelessness, misery, and wretchedness. Before him, BYRON—impassioned champion of high and generous sentiments—had mourned, although an Englishman, over the miseries of Green Erin; and when

GEORGE IV. visited that unhappy country, BYRON, indignant at the decadence of a People, who had not the spirit to raise themselves in their agony, to curse their tyrant, addressed Ireland in these lines, breathing the bitterness of a high expectation foiled. 'If aught,' he says—

'Could lessen my contempt for a nation so servile, yet sore,
'Tis the glory of Grattan, and genius of Moore!'

It was during this year and before this time, that the fact of O'CONNELL's connexion with the Freemasons, became known to the world. It appears that the year after he went to the bar—he became a member of the lodge 189, which then met in Dublin, and we have the authority of the *Freemasons' Quarterly Review*, for saying that "no mason ever went through the duties of a master of a lodge with greater brilliancy. He professed himself," the reviewer continues to say "warmly attached to the Order, and his actions proved it, until a dark hour came upon him, and he then shunned the light."

We are told he was a most prominent, accomplished and practical craftsman, working well in all the ceremonies, and was instrumental in introducing into the society, several of its most excellent members. The *Reviewer* goes on to say—

"It can be readily believed, how impressively DANIEL O'CONNELL must have delivered the beautiful ritual of the several degrees, and with what intensesness the candidates must have listened to that bewitching voice, that, in after days, captivated his delighted hearers at the bar, at public meetings, and in the senate. Yet, who is perfect? few can be weighed in the balance and not be found wanting; as in the political, so in his Masonic career, the flood and ebb tide were in singular contrast. Even O'CONNELL listened to the tempter, who poisoned

the ear, and gave to the lessons of truth a construction inimical to holiness—DANIEL O'CONNELL was expelled from the society of Irish Freemasons. We shall extract from our former numbers the admitted particulars of the case, repeating our opinion, that not only the policy but the propriety of expulsion, was at best but very questionable.

“ As the cause of his expulsion may be interesting, we shall extract from our former numbers some interesting particulars.

“ This distinguished Mason passed the chair of a Lodge in Dublin many years since, and filled the duties of his office with exemplary fidelity, but the claims which public business necessarily made upon his time, precluded the possibility of further active service; he therefore very reluctantly retired. Brother O'CONNELL is desirous that this, his only reason for absenting himself from meetings wherein he has derived so much social pleasure, and the still higher gratification arising from the instructive union of a moral with a scientific pursuit, should be generally known. Both in public and in private, he always pays homage to the order, by the declaration of its inestimable value to society; and thus cheerfully and thankfully adduces an additional instance of the power of masonry, to retain by its native grace and purity, the true allegiance of a singularly gifted brother, who, when in the society of his brother masons, whatever may be the difference of opinion upon other subjects, can and does ever and anon, discourse most eloquently upon the moral beauty of our mysteries.”

When this paragraph appeared in the *Freemasons Quarterly Review*, for April 1837, it was forthwith copied into all the papers in the three Kingdoms—the information was so unexpected. Mr. O'CONNELL, as he was a practical Ca-

tholic, opposed to the institution of Freemasonry, deemed it right to notice it, and accordingly on the 19th April, he addressed the following letter to the Editor of the *Pilot* :—

“ SIR—A paragraph has been going the rounds of the Irish newspapers, purporting to have my sanction, and stating that I had been at one time Master of a Masonic Lodge in Dublin, and still continue to belong to that Society.

“ I have since received letters addressed to me as a Freemason, and feel it incumbent on me to state the real facts.

“ It is true that I was a Freemason and a Master of a Lodge. It was at a very early period of my life, and either before an ecclesiastical censure had been published in the Catholic Church in Ireland, prohibiting the taking of the Masonic oaths, or at least before I was aware of that censure. I now wish to state, that having become acquainted with it, I submitted to its influence, and many, very many years ago, unequivocally renounced Freemasonry. I offered the late Archbishop, Dr. TROV, to make that renunciation public, but he deemed it unnecessary. I am not sorry to have this opportunity of doing so.

“ Freemasonry in Ireland may be said to have (apart from its oaths) no evil tendency, save as far as it may counteract, in some degree, the exertions of those most laudable and useful institutions—institutions deserving of every encouragement—the temperance societies.

“ But the great, the important objection is this—*the profane taking in vain the awful name of the Deity*--in the wanton and multiplied taking of oaths—of oaths administered on the book of GOD either in mockery or derision, or with a solemnity which renders the taking of

powered by his feelings, at what he looked upon as the discomfiture of his Leader, applied himself incontinently to his vinaigrette. Placid and collected, O'CONNELL looked around. A smile—O'CONNELL'S smile—lighted up his face, and raising his voice to its fullest pitch, he cried out—"Hear him, hear him, boys, 'tis the Chairman of the Knight of Kerry's Committee." You may well imagine what laughter, and cheering, and waving of hats followed this characteristic sally. Even the Conservative gentlemen cheered; and it has been gravely asserted, that the dandy of whom I have spoken, broke, in a paroxysm of laughter, his favorite heel-spur."

The returns of the new Parliament gave the Whigs a majority of about TWENTY-FIVE. Rather a slender one, considering the advantages they had—the prestige of a youthful Queen—the knowledge of her personal liking for the Whigs—and of the principles in which she had been educated—and the feelings of hostility which existed against the Tories, for their obstructive policy in reference to Municipal and Church Reform. The Carlton Club gold, on the other hand—the subserviency to their Landlords, of the English County constituencies—the religious prejudices of the English people—tended to sustain the power of the Conservative party. Sir ROBERT PEEL'S advice, too, had been taken; and the battle was well fought by the Tories at the hustings. We will see, by-and-bye, that the result was the triumph of the Conservatives.

In Ireland, every effort was made by O'CONNELL, for the success of the Ministers. The Queen and her Ministers was the rallying cry at the hustings. No other pledge was then required—no other test to try the patriotism of the candidate. Everything was comprised in the one recommendation—being the "Queen's Friends." Under the whole circumstances of the case, it

was perhaps as potent a rallying cry as either Municipal Reform or Tithe abolition. The people were impressed with the notion that the Orangemen were disposed to depose her MAJESTY, and place ERNEST AUGUSTUS, of Hanover, on the Throne. The feeling prevailed that there would be a fight for it—and right glad would they be to measure strength with their ancient foes in so loyal a cause. When O'CONNELL, at Rathcormac, in the County of Cork, barely hinted at the prospect, and asked the assembled thousands would they fight for the Queen, it is not possible to describe the enthusiasm which the suggestion produced. Every man in the vast multitude, absolutely bounded from the ground with delight. The QUEEN and her Ministers was a good motto for the hustings—and it did good service in Ireland. But we agree with SHARMAN CRAWFORD, that it was placing too implicit confidence in any Ministry. It was returning men to Parliament unpledged to any political measure, and only expected to vote with the Whig Government, and to accept all their measures, however meagre, and to agree to all their compromises, however disadvantageous. There was nothing in the past conduct of the Government, to justify this implicit confidence. There was no desire on their part to grapple with the Lords. On the contrary, agreement by fair compromise was their maxim; there was no disposition to extend the franchise to an equality with the franchise in England, or give us an adequate representation in the Imperial Parliament. On the contrary, we will find Lord MORPETH, the very best of the whole administration, opposing Mr. O'CONNELL's motion for a very moderate extension of the Parliamentary franchise. We think it was, at the time, most advisable to support the Whig Ministry, in order to crush the Orange party feeling which was then so

virulent in Ireland—and we think, next to the “Repeal,” the cry of the “QUEEN and her Ministers,” was the best that could be used; but, at the same time, the great political requirements of Ireland should not have been overlooked; and it should be borne in mind, that filling the administration of justice with honest men, and giving places to friends of the people, were not the sole things necessary. Mr. O'CONNELL, when Lord EBRINGTON, in 1841, declared that no Repealer should obtain office or place, showed to the Irish nation how few were the places at the disposal of the crown, compared to the vast mass of persons competent to fill them. In France, nearly the entire male adult population either hold office or are expectants of office under the Government—for, from road jobbing up to the Cabinet offices, all is under the control of the KING. But in these kingdoms it is different—Government interferes but little comparatively with the affairs of the people, and with the exception of places made only for Barristers—Clerkships in the Excise and Customs—and a few scattered offices in the Castle, Government has, happily, no patronage for the Catholic people of Ireland. It is clear, then, that no Government deserves support, alone because of their using their patronage for the benefit of the people.—Undoubtedly, the administration of justice is an exception; particularly in those days when the worst enemies of the people were placed on the Bench. But in 1837, such practices were passing away—politics were beginning no longer to taint the Justice seat. We have, for instance, seen how upright and impartial as a Judge, has been Sergeant JACKSON, who, when in Parliament, was one of the virulent opponents of popular rights. Besides, but few of the millions are interfered with by partizan Judges—whereas the laws which go to improve the social and political condition of the people, affect every

one; and therefore is it that their Representatives should distinctly state how far they were prepared to insist upon Reforms necessary for the amelioration of the country; and how far they were determined to make their support of any Government depend upon their views on those all-important subjects.

We agree, then, with SHARMAN CRAWFORD, that the QUEEN and her Ministers was not a constitutional cry during a popular Election. Mr. CRAWFORD addressed four letters, successively, to Mr. O'CONNELL, on this subject. He describes him as having more power than ever was possessed by Monarch, and he calls on him to use his influence for the purpose of pressing forward the measures which he himself so powerfully advocated. Having the vast power he possessed, we do think he placed too much confidence in the good intentions of the Government. He intended it, however, for a wise purpose, to give the experiment he was making a fair trial before he again raised the standard of Repeal. We are sorry he ever made the experiment, for it was scarcely possible it could be successful, nor was it. O'CONNELL, at a Meeting of the National Trades' Political Union, disposes of the statement that he had the patronage of the Irish Government, in the following humorous manner, and explains why it is he gave the Government his implicit confidence:—

“ Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD has asserted that a bargain was entered into between me and the Irish government—namely, that upon condition of their placing all the Irish patronage at my disposal, I would give them my unqualified support. Now, I do not wish to accuse Mr. CRAWFORD of saying what is wilfully untrue. I believe he would not do so. I believe, moreover, he is a man of honour—but he certainly is a man of very great indiscretion. That assertion of his has been taken up

by the Scotch newspapers—and even *Tait's Magazine* has circulated the calumny among its readers. Now, what has been the consequence to me?—why, there is not a single office under the government that I have not been applied to for since. One man has written to me to get him the command of a 74—another requesting I would get him the command of a Regiment—and a third, who represented himself as a liberal Protestant of the established church, requested I would give him an appointment in an endowed school. The fact is, that every species of office, from the highest down to the chimney-sweeper at the castle, has been applied for, and my recommendation required. I declare to you most solemnly, that it would take me ten days to answer all the letters, on this very subject, I have got this very day. Now who am I to blame but SHARMAN CRAWFORD, for all this? for, when the calumny was heretofore promulgated by the Tory press, no one believed it; but at present the cry is ‘O, it must be true, for Mr. CRAWFORD knows all the secrets, and he is a man who would not assert what is not strictly and literally true.’ Thus you see what I have got by his letter writing. The fact is, I cannot answer half of the letters I receive connected with the matter. The other day, I received a communication from a Scotchman, complaining of my want of politeness in not answering a letter, where he requested of me to get him the office of commander-in-chief, or that of Chief Justice in Ireland. Yet though I am aware that by my seeming negligence, I create a great deal of enemies for myself, yet, what can I do? Now, Sir, I challenge SHARMAN CRAWFORD, to cite one single case—one single appointment made in Ireland at my instance—so far from having given away any thing or recommending any person. I’ll tell you more, that I made it my

business to look through the list of places disposed of, when I found that three-fourths of those appointments by Government, to official situations, were English and Scotch, and not Irish. I should have been well pleased to be enabled to give that list to the public, when they would instantly see the scale of appointments; but that, deeming it would be an invidious task in putting forward the names of individuals, I forbore to do so. I have, however, the paper in my possession; indeed I sent it to a friend of the ministers, and am ready to produce it to SHARMAN CRAWFORD any time he pleases—and here, I call on him to retract the charge he has thus put forward, or sustain it by a single fact. I challenge him to name one appointment given in consequence of my interference; or, in fact, that I took any part at all in the transaction. Sir, I support the Government from far different motives—I do so because they are the friends of humanity, and because their mode of acting in Ireland, has been what we had never known before—governing the people for their own benefit—giving them equal and impartial justice, and not according to the dictates or spirit of a faction who have ever trampled and trodden upon the country. There is a vast improvement now in the management of affairs at the Castle—the friends of the country are not despised as was the case heretofore; but good men of all religious persuasions are selected by government to fill the most important stations, without making any religious or political distinction. I support the government, because they are determined to identify our rights with those of the people of England and Scotland; I support them, because they are doing their utmost to aid me in carrying out the great experiment which I am now making. I would not have thus said so much of myself, if persons had not attributed unworthy motives to me, in the course I am

now pursuing. I have not entered into a compact with any one ; my great object is to have my country benefited, and I trust ere long, I shall see the first wish of my heart fulfilled. The name of freedom is beginning to shed its genial ray upon Ireland—it is becoming brighter and brighter still, freshening and glowing in its noon-day splendour upon us—we see a prospect of entire and impartial justice being done our country. It is said that I despair—that my expectations are chilled—and that my aspirations for my country's liberty, have been frozen by the chill of disappointment. In this they are entirely mistaken, for never was I so full of hope ; and although I am perfectly aware of the difficulty which exists in obtaining justice from a British parliament ; yet those difficulties will, I have no doubt, be overcome with the government of Lord MULGRAVE in Ireland, with the countenance of a young, unsophisticated, lovely and highly educated Queen."

Lord MULGRAVE unquestionably acted his part with a fearless spirit. His government was a continued warfare against the powerful Orange system. This year, he dismissed, from the Magistracy, Colonel VERNER and Colonel PERCEVAL—or at least did not recommend either of them to be continued in the new Commission of the Peace, to be issued at the commencement of the new reign. Both were the leading Orangemen of Ireland—and both held high office in the society, under the Hanoverian KING. Colonel VERNER was dismissed for having given, at an election dinner, given by himself—but the proceedings of which were published—the toast of the BATTLE OF THE DIAMOND—as commemorative of the conflict in 1795, between the Catholics and Orangemen in the North—in which the latter were victorious. The dismissal of VERNER caused a very great sensation

throughout Orangeland. The following song, written at the time, illustrates the bitter feeling which existed :—

I.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 Round, loyal, let it pass !
 We'll drink it with a glowing soul,
 And from a ruby glass !
 Full let the rich red wine pour forth
 Its fountain and its flood—
 In token that the loyal won
 That battle with their blood !

II.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 (Far let the watchword fly),
 Where craven Papist rebels crouched
 Upon the earth to die.
Slain by devoted men and true,
 Who fought with heart and blade ;
 And *slaughtered* in their ambush vile,
 By swords they had betrayed.

III.

The Battle of the Diamond!—
 We'll toast it well and wide—
 Shamed rebels ! let it rouse alike
 Their passion and their pride !
 And if the coward host again
 Fling wide the traitor's door,
 We'll meet them, and we'll battle them,
 And vanquish as before.

IV.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 A triumph song we sing—
 We care not how the rebels roar,
 Nor how the welkin ring ;
 The shouts of Protestants shall swell,
 Voice-borne from shore to shore ;
 And it shall be in Ireland
 A toast for evermore !

V.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 A triumph song we sing,
 Hurrah ! we fought it for our faith—
 We won it for our King !

Our King ! whom Papist fools denied
 To follow Priest and Pope ;
 But fall'n, we left them without life,
 And, living, without hope !

VI,

The Battle of the Diamond !
 Again fill full the bowl !
 And, as more generous spirits rise,
 Let traitors' shrink in soul !
Theirs was the net the cowards cast—
 The *prize*, too, was their own—
 Slaughter from good and gallant men
 Who battled for the throne !

VII.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 And would they stay the toast ?
 We dare them with their Moloch power,
 And with their millioned host.
 Lo ! at the shadow of a soul,
 The robbers quail beneath
 The Battle of the Diamond !
We drink it in their teeth.

VIII.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 Again, and yet again !
 We waft it on the wings of wine,
 We won it on the plain !—
 And memory is the sacred shrine,
 When those high deeds we hoard ;
 And what we gathered in the field,
 We cherish at the board !

IX.

The battle of the Diamond !
 Ye rebels, quake and start !
 We fought it, sound of loyalty,
 We drink it sound of heart !
 Let puny rulers fill with spite
 Spite's measure o'er and o'er ;
 Still shall it be in Ireland
 A toast for evermore !

X.

The Battle of the Diamond !
 Round, loyal, let it pass ;
 We'll drink it with a glowing soul,
 And from a ruby glass !
 Full let the rich red wine pour forth
 Its fountain and its flood,
 In token that the loyal won
 The battle with their blood !

O'CONNELL, in order still further to testify his confidence in the Queen's Government, moved and carried, on the first of November, the demolition of the General Association. His speech, in promoting this important step was one of the most impressive he ever delivered at the Corn Exchange. It would be doing it, and the observation applies alike indeed to all his speeches, injustice, to attempt to give of it even an outline. The following was the principal of the series of resolutions with which he concluded :—

“ That, impressed with the most lively gratitude to the Earl of MULGRAVE, for his firm, manly, humane, and perfectly impartial administration of the government of Ireland, and reposing unlimited confidence in the sincere and unequivocal disposition of her MAJESTY'S present ministers, to do justice to Ireland, by placing her on a footing of equality with England and Scotland ; but, above all, and before all, filled with most respectful and dutiful gratitude to her most gracious MAJESTY, for the enlightened and patriotic policy which has distinguished the commencement of her auspicious reign, we do, under these circumstances, deem it a proof of our confidence in the existing administration, to declare that this Association is dissolved ; devolving the carrying out of its purposes into full effect on the Irish popular members in aid and support of the QUEEN'S Government.”

The following translation, from a Paris Journal, the

Courier Francais, pretty accurately expresses the opinion entertained in France, as indeed in Ireland and England, of O'CONNELL's power, as demonstrated by this step :—

“ A spectacle of deep interest, and unexpected occurrence, commands, just now, the attention of England. The individual of modern times who has best known how to address assembled masses in suitable language, and whose eloquent and impassioned voice, never betrayed into the pomp of declamation, and seldom descending to the trivial or common place, is sure to impress, with thrilling vibration, on the ear and heart, the generous and popular feelings to which it gives utterance—he, who has maintained over the Irish people, and, it may be said, over the British population, an ascendancy beyond example—who has assumed, and so justly merits, the title of the *Great Agitator*—O'CONNELL has laid down the sceptre of Agitation, which he for so many years wielded, in despite of the British Aristocracy, to whom he thus hurls a bolder defiance than his bitterest philippics and most audacious strain of invective had ever conveyed. The abdication of sovereign power by SYLLA, did not cause greater astonishment in Rome, than this dissolution of the Irish Association is calculated to excite over Europe. But, more fortunate for the Irish dictator, O'CONNELL resigns the emblem of his power, pure and spotless of blood, with the conscious gratification that the passions which he had roused had never transgressed the bounds of good order. He too well understood the interests of the popular cause, not to feel that it could only derive strength from reason and justice, or fall by its own excesses.

“ Few Reformers have been happy enough to witness the accomplishment of their enterprise, or to see it reach that point of perfection which renders its further move-

ments independent of their exertions. For O'CONNELL only does it appear reserved, to receive the benedictions of the people whose liberation he had undertaken, in accents of gratitude undamped by those recollections of blood-stained scenes of which Ireland has so often been the theatre. O'CONNELL has solved the great problem of legal resistance to oppression, which, from the impatience of a suffering people, has hitherto appeared a delusion—he has shown that the uttermost verge of insurrection may be approached without over-leaping its barrier; that a revolution may be achieved without fire of cannon, and that the Bastile may be overthrown without being stormed. The work of difficulty was, not to have set in movement these mighty masses, and made every impulse obedient to his will, but when in conscious possession of power, and within view of the great object of their contest, thus to induce the voluntary surrender of their matured organization, and implicitly to confide in the Government, of which they had so long experienced the oppression, is a source of astonishment and admiration, and evidence of the highest moral influence which man can exercise over his fellow man.

“But let not the British aristocracy delusively contemplate its position. This suspension of the reign of agitation is the necessary pause allowed it for deliberation and submission; for if, unhappily, it resumed its ascendancy in the Royal Councils, and in attempting to arrest the advance of Reform, disappointed the confidence, and foiled the hopes of the Association, who will say that the Great Agitator may not feel bound, in vindication of himself from this seeming betrayal of his adherents, to grasp his tremendous power, and wield it with unscrupulous energy?”

Public attention was now directed to the New Parliament about to assemble. It promised to be a Session of

stirring interest. The Tories, determined, no matter what the expense, to accomplish, by petitions against the Irish Liberal Representatives, what they could not effect on the hustings, entered into large subscriptions to form a fund in order to carry on proceedings before Election Committees, against the entire body of the Irish Liberal members. The object was two-fold—firstly, by petitioning against them, to prevent their being on Election Committees, and thus secure the appointment of their own friends—to try the validity of such returns as would be *bona fide* concocted in Committee; and secondly, to endeavour to turn their present minority in the House of Commons, into a majority. The strength of parties was so nearly balanced, and it was by no means improbable that such a speculation would be successful, as it was notorious how the decisions of Election Committees were arrived at. Last year, the plan, though tried on a limited scale, was very expensive. The prosecution, of the petition against O'CONNELL alone, cost forty thousand pounds; the greater portion of which was defrayed by the joint stock purse of the Carlton Club. This year the system was put in operation on a wholesale scale. The Conservatives were trembling for their ancient ascendancy, and their long established monopolies; and one other effort it was determined to make, to wrest power from the grasp of the destroyer. To get up petitions everywhere, with or without foundation, was the policy adopted. Mr. SPOTTISWOODE, the QUEEN'S printer—but a man of enormous wealth and a determined Tory, was at the head and front of the scheme.—Hence, it was called the "SPOTTISWOODE CONSPIRACY"—Very large subscriptions were entered into. Amongst others—Sir FRANCIS BURDETT publicly sent his subscription. The whole proceeding was so manifest a breach of privilege that the subject,

early in the Session, was brought by SMITH O'BRIEN under the notice of Parliament—He presented a petition from himself. After some discussion on the point of order, the petition was ordered to be printed. It was during the discussion on this petition that O'CONNELL was absolutely hooted down, and not allowed to utter a word, though he merely rose to offer an explanation. Mr. SMITH O'BRIEN followed up his first step by a motion for a select committee of inquiry. The Government opposed it, though the ATTORNEY-GENERAL stated distinctly that the subscription was illegal—The grounds for this opposition were, that it would lead to no result. It was not contemplated to take criminal proceedings against the individual subscribers to the fund—and it would be inexpedient to enter on the breach of privilege question. The motion for inquiry was consequently lost—and the “SPOTTISWOODE gang” were allowed to carry their warfare against the return of every liberal member of Parliament. It was in truth a contention of wealth against wealth, in which the longest purse must be triumphant. The longest purse belonged to the monopolists. Therefore, it was easy to perceive at which side, in such a contest, victory would be. There was but one remedy, and that was to petition against every member. This would prevent any petition being tried at either side. This plan, though urged with much earnestness and talent at the time, was not followed out—The Government having opposed Mr. SMITH O'BRIEN's motion, it was, as a matter of course, lost by a large majority.

O'CONNELL still maintained his popularity in England, and we find that, towards the close this year, 1837, he was entertained at Stockport, at Norwich, and at Birmingham. In each of these places the usual anxiety existed to hear him, and in each he was enthusiastically received. He presided, also, at a meeting in behalf of Po-

land. It will be readily admitted too, that on such a subject he was in his element. Nothing could be more graphic or more effective than his description, on this occasion, of the manner in which the children of burghers of Warsaw were, by order of NICHOLAS, forcibly carried off into Russia. It was about this time, that a naval gentleman, whose duties took him periodically to Russia, met O'CONNELL in Pall Mall, and asked him, laughing, whether he had any message to the EMPEROR—"Tell the black-guard to behave himself," was the quaint and scornful reply of the LIBERATOR, as he hastily passed on to the House of Commons.

We find O'CONNELL enthusiastically received at the great Westminster reform meeting, in December, 1837, at the Crown and Anchor. His speech on this occasion was in his best style. His concluding sentences were received with deafening shouts of applause.—"Let," he said, "the voice of this meeting, and of the whole country be raised to that pitch that it may be urged through the whole fabric of St. STEPHEN'S, and through the thick stone walls of the Star Chamber. In doing so, show some gratitude to the Irish people—recollect that they are one-third of the empire—that they are a people who have been crushed down to the very verge of despair, and that the dawn of kindness is just breaking in upon them. I wish not to agitate the question of the Repeal of the Union again. I wish the people of Ireland to be part and parcel of the British Empire. I have often spoken to you of Ireland—how I love that country, none but myself can tell. That love is deeply engraven on the tablets of my heart. I was born in that beloved land; among her green and beautiful scenery my childhood was spent—I roved among her sublime and beautiful mountains—I grew up a wild mountain boy, and became in love with the majestic scenery of my native land. I found

my countrymen in slavery, but 'the iron had not entered their souls,' the spirit of freedom lived in their hearts—I led them on to many a victory—no violence, no tumult—without a sigh, except from the miscreants whom we had robbed of their ill-gotten prey. I sacrificed to them one of the largest professional emoluments ever received; they have generously, nobly, more than repaid me. I stand before you, called in their simple gratitude by the glorious name of 'LIBERATOR.' And prouder am I of this voluntary compensation, than the titled nobleman of his treasure. I stand before you a lover of my native land, but ready to join you in every struggle for freedom; and I ask you to use that sound discrimination in politics, which has led you on through such a glorious march of discoveries and improvements in sciences and arts. The Tories are execrable. The Whigs are bad, but (as we understood the Honourable and Learned Gentleman,) not so bad. Or shall I go back to my countrymen, and say that I appealed by the hour to English gratitude in vain—that you shouted against the Whigs, and abandoned Ireland—that, in the selfish struggle for your own rights, you forgot ours. Oh, no! I conjure you, as for the beings I love best—I have some grand-children—not to take such a course—if you do, you will at least respect me—we will send back this answer, 'we are seven millions'—and, having all the bad against us, and the good or neutral assisting us only by their cheers and huzzas, instead of practical efforts—I will address them thus:—

' Hereditary bondsmen, know ye not,
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.' "

It was towards the close of 1837, that O'CONNELL risked his popularity, and his seat in Parliament for Dublin—nay, his life, for endeavouring to induce the Trades of Dublin to give up the system of combination which unhappily was so injurious to their own interests,

as well as to the interests of the country. This system from the very earliest period has been an abetting cause in the destruction of Irish manufactures. We do not mean fair legitimate combination, such as HUSKISSON'S Act sanctions, and which enables workmen to combine to put what price they deem fair upon their own labour.—But we allude to that illegal combination which would punish an operative who was willing to sell his labour at a less rate—or would not permit a master to take any number of apprentices he chose.—This is the combination against which O'CONNELL contended. His sense of right and justice induced him to do so. It has been often said that he would sacrifice honor, consistency, truth, for popular applause.—His conduct on this occasion—his determined hostility to Poor Laws—his abandonment of Repeal, in order to try what a reformed English Parliament would do—all prove beyond question, that he would never permit the transitory sunshine of popular favor to turn him from the direct and honest course. The very intemperance with which he is charged, proves his utter indifference to what may be thought of his acts or language.

The origin of this dispute was a speech O'CONNELL delivered at the Dublin Trades' Political Union, on the seventh November, 1837. The state of Dublin, and indeed of several cities in the three kingdoms, arising from the spirit of combination, was very alarming to the peaceful and industrious.—O'CONNELL took the part of the masters in the quarrel, for he saw that the operatives were in reality their masters.—In a speech of great force of argument, and in a moderate quiet tone, he advised and remonstrated against the practises which impeded the legitimate exercise of industry.—He, in conclusion, moved and carried the following resolution :—

“ That we now again, in the strongest terms of which

language is capable, denounce all secret and illegal societies and combinations of every description, particularly the infatuated and cruel system of illegal combination, which has manifested itself among the labouring classes in this metropolis and its vicinities, and which has been attended with the most appalling of all crimes, the violent shedding of human blood! We implore of the individuals engaged in these foul conspiracies, to instantly renounce all connexion therewith—to contribute to no system of secret conspiracy; that no system of personal violence or injury to property can ever advance the interest of the labourers; but, on the very contrary, ruin their prospects, and bring desolation on themselves and their unfortunate country. In their wicked confederacy, they must be in constant dread of betrayal by each other, for men joined in unlawful undertakings can never be faithful; and they may rest assured that the vengeance of their outraged God, and the severe but just punishment of the laws, will not fail to overtake their abominable crimes.”

His speech, and the resolution, excited the ire of the Dublin Trades, and several meetings, where O'CONNELL attended, were the consequence. He succeeded, after some opposition, in getting the Trades to appoint a Committee to meet him—when he undertook to prove to them that they were injuring themselves by the conduct pursued. He was, owing to indisposition, unable to meet them—on the appointed day, in the last week of the year 1837.—We must therefore follow up the narrative of this remarkable incident in O'CONNELL's career unto the next year. On the ninth of January, 1838, the Trades of Dublin met, for the purpose of hearing Mr. O'CONNELL's address to them. He first defended himself from the attacks made on him at the meeting from which he was absent. Amongst other charges, it was stated at that meet-

ing that he did not himself encourage Irish manufacture. To this he made the following reply :—

“I now come to another charge made against me by a Mr. M'DONOGH, viz., that I bought a carriage in London, in preference to Dublin. I was about eight years at the bar, when I got a carriage—I bought it in Dublin—I bought it, and paid for it, at HUTTON'S; I bought a second carriage at COOPER'S, in Mary-street; a third at COOPER'S; and a fourth and fifth at HUTTON'S, for all of which I paid. Now, I ask, has any single individual, with five times my means, since the Union, purchased five carriages in Dublin? Nay, more—two of my daughters, when they were married at my house in Merrion-square, purchased a carriage each; so that out of one house in Dublin seven carriages were bought. I have, therefore, bought twice as many carriages as any other family in Dublin; but that would be no excuse for my getting a carriage in London. Do you know what my answer is to Mr. M'DONOGH? I mean that individual no harm, but I am bound to say that his assertion is a falsehood. I never got a carriage built in London—I never got a barouche, a britzka, a gig, or anything else built in London. I even get my pantaloons, my coats and my waistcoats, made in Dublin. I was attacked by one of the tailors also, and I now ask him does he know any body else, who when he wants a waistcoat in London sends to Dublin for it? I don't wear a stitch that is not bought at JERRY M'CARTHY'S. He is a relation of my own, and I am proud of him. I have not a better relation living than that tailor. Were these assertions then fair towards the employers of Dublin tradesmen? I remember upon one occasion, when going from London to Brighton, and from thence to Edinburgh and Glasgow, in company with one whose society I can never again enjoy, I exchanged a carriage for a second hand

light chaise ; but as for buying a carriage in London, I did so as much as I bought a tower. I have run my Dublin carriages against the English made carriages of Irish members, from Holyhead to London, without a brace being strained or a nut moved. This carriage was bought at HUTTON'S, and was superior to the English carriages. This is my explanation, and be kind enough Mr. Chairman to tell the thirty honest men who gave the address, that I would be ashamed to look my fellow-countrymen in the face, if I were capable of expending one penny out of Ireland—and one of my greatest afflictions is, that I am compelled, by my parliamentary duty, to spend one shilling amongst the English."

This meeting went off comparatively quietly—a series of resolutions condemnatory of the existing spirit of combination, proposed by Mr. O'CONNELL, were passed, and in the hope of calming the exasperated feelings of the operatives, the erection of a Trades' Hall was proposed by Mr. PETER PURCELL, who filled the chair, and a subscription entered into—Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. PETER PURCELL both subscribing one hundred pounds each. There were two meetings after this. At the third meeting, the Lord Mayor presided. Every person admitted had to pay one shilling, to secure the proceedings from disturbance. However, there was a large attendance of the operatives as well as of masters. At this meeting two resolutions were proposed. The first was—

"That we have beheld with grief and indignation, a system of illegal combination pervade several of the trades and many of the working classes of this city, and we deplore the existence of such a system the more, because it involves not only a direct and avowed breach of the law, but its obvious tendency and result have been and are, to diminish work, to drive away capital, and to lessen the amount of employment and of wages to workmen of all descriptions."

This being general in its character, was passed without much opposition, but the proposing of the second resolution was the signal of the greatest uproar. It was—“That we, in particular, deprecate and condemn the presuming, in direct violation of the law, to limit the number of apprentices, and the unjust and injurious as well as illegal practices of enforcing a uniform rate of wages for all classes of workmen, and of coercing employers to employ particular individuals selected or approved of by the workmen and not the employer himself.”

It is impossible to describe the rioting and confusion which followed, particularly when Mr. O'CONNELL got up to speak. The bellowing, with which he was lately received by the Tories in the House of Commons, was suavity and mildness compared to the manner in which he was treated by men whom he was sincerely anxious to serve. When he was leaving the meeting an attempt was made to assault him, and had he not had the assistance of the authorities, some violence would undoubtedly have been offered him.

Another meeting was held by adjournment, at which the Lord Mayor again presided. Here O'CONNELL manfully faced the whole body of the Trades—commented on the Rules—of which he had copies—of each Trade and showed them to be illegal. But he was not listened to. The greatest confusion prevailed and the most insulting language was directed against him. Well, he persevered and was enabled occasionally to finish a sentence, and then was interrupted by a burst of indignation. The hostility of the Tradesmen was most violent, and on leaving the meeting, he was received with deep and continued groans. The extent to which this frightful combination had now reached, and the outrages committed were such, that Dr. MURRAY, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, had to address the

Catholic Tradesmen on the enormity of the sins they were guilty of. His address was mild, yet firm, eloquent and convincing, and had a very considerable effect. But the spirit of combination was too wide spread to be checked even by such powerful incentives to virtue as such a document from so eminent a divine. It existed in England and Scotland. Thousands of pounds were expended in keeping up the system of combination and enforcing their laws. From the Manchester Trades' Union an Address came to the Dublin Trades, in which, after denouncing O'CONNELL, they suggest assassination in the following words :—

“ Fellow workmen!—Until you rid yourselves of that insidious foe, you will never obtain possession of your social rights. With him we are not safe. Without him we could fight the battle of our freedom more effectively, and speedily achieve a triumph for our cause, and real justice for Ireland ”

The Glasgow and Edinburgh cotton spinners, were convicted of the most disgraceful acts, in furtherance of their objects—and in Dublin there were several convictions. Still the spirit was not subdued, and a Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider the entire question of combination amongst the working class. From the consequence of their evil acts, O'CONNELL endeavoured, as their best friend, to save them. He risked his life and popularity in the attempt, but he, too, was unsuccessful.

This conduct of O'CONNELL, on this memorable occasion, is beyond all praise. He encountered obloquy—abuse—nay, personal danger, for the sakes of the persons who assaulted him. Several murders had lately taken place, owing to the wicked system of combination which then prevailed. Government were determined to crush it by the strong arm of the law. O'CONNELL preferred meet-

ing the combinator face to face, and, by reasoning with them, endeavour to get them to abandon practices which kept down the manufacturing industry of the country, and led to so much crime. He did not succeed, but the attempt he made proved his disinterestedness—his honesty and his courage.

The Annuity was collected, in 1837, in the month of May. The following is the annual address, which on this occasion the Writer of this Memoir drew up. It was nobly responded to by the people. Those addresses will be inserted, each at the end of the year when it was written, as it is an epitome of O'CONNELL'S career during that brief period.

“ FELLOW-CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN!—Over eighteen months have elapsed since we last addressed you in behalf of our tried and valued Patriot, who has so long, so zealously, and so honestly served us—who has raised our Country from her enslaved and prostrate condition—who, in order to obtain for us an equality of rights, is still struggling, with untiring nerve and unshrinking resolution, against the prejudices, the jealousies—the antipathies of the sister land; and who, while he opened the door to professional rank and emolument to his less distinguished countrymen, sought for no place or office in compensation for either his services or his sacrifices, but preferred the nobler recompence flowing from a People's gratitude, and threw himself, without pledge or condition, on the justice—the honor—the patriotism of the Irish Nation.

“ FELLOW CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN!—The unlimited and concentrated confidence of Eight Millions of People has raised O'CONNELL to a high and unprecedented station, which requires, for public and political objects, a vast expensuré, far beyond what an ordinary income can maintain; and therefore is it that so long as that

confidence is bestowed, so long ought that expenditure be defrayed by the Nation to whose service he has dedicated his health—his talents—his whole existence; and therefore was it that in our last address, we appealed to your feelings as patriots, and to your sense of justice. Nobly and honorably did you respond to that call. The same circumstances still exist, the same arguments still apply; we reiterate the appeal to your justice and patriotism, and in the present aspect of political affairs we superadd an appeal to your National pride. Look to Westminster—the City which we imagined concentrated, as it were, all the intelligence—the public spirit—the political feelings of the people of England. What do we observe? Hateful prejudice, unmeaning jealousy and black ingratitude towards this country. They cannot, it is true, forget that the blood of Irishmen has flowed profusely for the cause of England. The lines of Torres Vedras—the plains of Talavera—the walls of St. Sebastian—the field of Waterloo—too truly attest the fact—they cannot deny that their recent political liberties were won by Irishmen. The divisions on the English Reform and Municipal Bills, too indelibly demonstrate it; but they continue deaf to our claims on their gratitude, and pay but a cold and heartless attention to our demands. What is the inference? That we must in future depend upon ourselves—that we must show the world there is energy, union, and determination enough amongst Irishmen, to secure justice without England's assistance.

“ How is this national determination to be exhibited? Not alone by public meetings and indignant language; nor by petitions, breathing the firm resolve of the people; but also by rallying round, with purse and heart, the man whom Ireland has selected as her Representative—in whose eloquence is concentrated the voice of millions;—in whose energy is combined the strength

and determination of an entire people ;—who is abused—maligned—hated and libelled, because he is, as it were, a living personification of his Country—breathing a Nation's sentiments and wielding a Nation's power.

“ FELLOW CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN !—Do you recollect the Catholic Rent? Do you remember its prodigious effect in securing religious freedom for your country? How the enemies of Ireland quailed beneath the power it developed How the hero of a hundred fights shrunk from collision with the national resolve and energy it indicated? Even at the present moment, see the silent and increasing influence the General Association is acquiring through the agency of Justice Rent. Observe the alarm of the lordly aristocrats of England. How well and surely does their experience enable them to calculate the result. Why is this? Not in consequence of the power money of itself bestows; but because it is a sure and steady index of the People's feelings—because it is the thermometer by which the warmth of those feelings can be best ascertained, and in proportion as the contributions increase or diminish in such proportion are the National sentiments indicated. So it is with the O'CONNELL ANNUITY. Independent of the just and requisite assistance it affords to a deserving Patriot, it is a great political engine—it is a mighty instrument which exhibits with precision to the world, the degree of energy and determination existing amongst the Irish People. It proclaims with certainty the strength and extent of their union, in working out their political regeneration, and in proportion as Ireland's contributions decrease or diminish, in such proportion must be estimated the patriotism—the ardour, and the justice of the People.

“ FELLOW CITIZENS AND COUNTRYMEN !—Do not on this occasion allow your contributions to indicate a less

ardent feeling of attachment to your Country. It is true you are appealed to at a period when a very considerable pressure prevails amongst the mercantile and agricultural classes. This is inevitable. Why was not the appeal made last October, when prices were high—when the country was in a state of comparative prosperity—when the mercantile community was in a flourishing condition, and when the collection would have been abundant? Because it was necessary for the welfare of Ireland to establish the Justice Rent, and thereby to uphold the great National Association which O'CONNELL had organized. Therefore was it that, throwing aside all personal feelings, and regardless of his private interests, he refused to permit the Annuity to interfere with the establishment of that mighty political engine.

“Fellow Citizens and Countrymen! Will you allow his disinterestedness to diminish the amount of this National Annuity? Will it not rather induce you to throw aside the consideration of the peculiar time in which we make to you this appeal, and stimulate you to come forward as you have ever done—to sustain him against the hatred and unrelenting persecution of Ireland's enemies, and to protect him from the enormous expenditure which your confidence has entailed?”

“Fellow Citizens and Countrymen! You have hitherto taken the lead on this great national occasion. Be not backward now. Recollect the MORAL POWER, developed, organized and sustained by O'CONNELL, is the great engine by which we can alone hope to obtain justice for our Country. Bear in mind how great will be the moral effect produced, if, at this period of the year, and during a temporary pressure, you warmly rally round O'CONNELL. Sustain him as nobly as you have ever done, and shew your devotion to Ireland by your exertions and your contributions on Sunday, the 28th

May next—the day appointed for this National Collection.”

We have now brought the history of our illustrious countryman to the termination of the year 1837, and here we propose to conclude the SECOND VOLUME OF HIS LIFE AND TIMES. We did hope that we should have been enabled to compress into two volumes the entire history of his life. But his latter years are so full of events personal and political, that it was impossible with any regard to his memory or to truth to accomplish it. No amount of compression, consistent with justice to the subject, could effect it. The events of the remaining ten years of his life, so full of enduring interest to the Irish nation, must be recorded in a separate volume, and we feel confident the same public favor with which our labours have been hitherto received, will be accorded to the deeply interesting portion of the work which remains to be published.

Looking back on the life of O'CONNELL since Emancipation, and after he became a member of the Imperial legislature, we must be forcibly struck with the extraordinary political power he achieved—the little advantage for private or personal ends he derived from his exalted position—and the unmitigated charges and unrelenting attacks, to which, in consequence of that position, he was unceasingly subjected. No subject ever possessed, for so long a time, such enormous power. We read, in the history of all nations, of men, who, by their military successes, and by the force of arms, attained to eminence and to command, over millions of their fellowmen, but, in all these, there never lived one of the human kind, but O'CONNELL, who, by the power of talent and character alone, without the aid of force, attained and possessed the power he did. Yet he turned it not to his own advantage. He was, it is true, sustained in his

high position, by the annual contributions of the people—but those contributions were devoted in their service to public purposes, or to acts of generous friendship—for O'CONNELL was in personal expenditure most frugal. What he received from the people in a great measure went back to the people. The result was, as we will hereafter see—he died not in affluent circumstances. In return for his patriotism what did he receive? He earned the undying hatred of Ireland's enemies. Every species of abuse—every mode of attack was resorted to in order to sully his fame. We have seen how successfully he rose out of every such attack. The RAPHAEL charge fell to the ground, so did the Factory calumny. In the midst of all, his mind was calm and his determination unshaken. He pursued his course to the end with a perseverance and energy unequalled. We will see this nobly exemplified in the various events of his illustrious career to be recorded in the next volume.

10

END OF VOL. II.

7569
4

This book is a preservation photocopy.
It was produced on Hammermill Laser Print natural white,
a 60 # book weight acid-free archival paper
which meets the requirements of
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (permanence of paper)

Preservation photocopying and binding

by

Acme Bookbinding

Charlestown, Massachusetts



1995

BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 026 17060 5

